arXiv:1206.2601v3 [math.AP] 23 Jan 2013

ERROR ESTIMATES AND CONVERGENCE RATES FOR THE STOCHASTIC HOMOGENIZATION OF HAMILTON-JACOBI EQUATIONS

SCOTT N. ARMSTRONG, PIERRE CARDALIAGUET, AND PANAGIOTIS E. SOUGANIDIS

Abstract. We present exponential error estimates and demonstrate an algebraic convergence rate for the homogenization of level-set convex Hamilton-Jacobi equations in i.i.d. random environments, the first quantitative homogenization results for these equations in the stochastic setting. By taking advantage of a connection between the metric approach to homogenization and the theory of first-passage percolation, we obtain estimates on the fluctuations of the solutions to the approximate cell problem in the ballistic regime (away from flat spot of the effective Hamiltonian). In the sub-ballistic regime (on the flat spot), we show that the fluctuations are governed by an entirely different mechanism and the homogenization may proceed, without further assumptions, at an arbitrarily slow rate. We identify a necessary and sufficient condition on the law of the Hamiltonian for an algebraic rate of convergence to hold in the sub-ballistic regime and show, under this hypothesis, that the two rates may be merged to yield comprehensive error estimates and an algebraic rate of convergence for homogenization.

Our methods are novel and quite different from the techniques employed in the periodic setting, although we benefit from previous works in both first-passage percolation and homogenization. The link between the rate of homogenization and the flat spot of the effective Hamiltonian, which is related to the nonexistence of correctors, is a purely random phenomenon observed here for the first time.

1. Introduction

We consider the Hamilton-Jacobi equation

$$u_t^\varepsilon + H(Du^\varepsilon, \tfrac{x}{\varepsilon}, \omega) = 0 \quad \text{in } \mathbb{R}^d \times (0,\infty), \tag{1.1}$$

where the Hamiltonian $H = H(p,y,\omega)$ is level-set convex and coercive in p and depends on an element ω of an underlying probability space $(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, \mathbb{P})$. If the action of translation on $\mathbb{R}^d$ is stationary and ergodic with respect to the law of H, then, as $\varepsilon \to 0$, the solutions $u^\varepsilon = u^\varepsilon(x,t,\omega)$ of (1.1), subject to appropriate initial conditions, converge $\mathbb{P}$-almost surely to the solution u of the deterministic equation

$$u_t + \overline{H}(Du) = 0 \quad \text{in } \mathbb{R}^d \times (0,\infty) \tag{1.2}$$

with the same initial conditions, where the effective Hamiltonian $\overline{H} \in C(\mathbb{R}^d)$ is level-set convex and coercive. This fundamental theorem concerning the qualitative theory of stochastic homogenization of Hamilton-Jacobi equations was proved for convex Hamiltonians by one of the authors [32] (see also Rezakhanlou and Tarver [31]) and, more recently, by two of the authors [4] in the generality discussed here.

In this paper, we present the first quantitative homogenization results for Hamilton-Jacobi equations in the stochastic setting. Throughout the paper we assume that the Hamiltonian

---

Date: January 24, 2013.

2010 *Mathematics Subject Classification.* 35B27, 35F21, 60K35.

Key words and phrases. stochastic homogenization, error estimate, convergence rate, Hamilton-Jacobi equation, first-passage percolation.

$H = H(p, y, \omega)$ satisfies a finite range dependence hypothesis (a continuum analogue of "i.i.d.") in its spatial dependence. This essentially means that, for some fixed distance $D > 0$, the values of $H(p, y, \cdot)$ for $y \in E$ are independent of those for $y \in F$ provided that $\operatorname{dist}(E, F) > D$.

By a novel integration of probabilistic and pde techniques, we (i) obtain explicit estimates showing the probability that $|u^\varepsilon(x, t, \omega) - u(x, t)| > \lambda$ decays exponentially in λ^2, and (ii) identify a necessary and sufficient condition for the almost sure, local uniform convergence $u^\varepsilon \to u$ to proceed at an algebraic rate $O(\varepsilon^\alpha)$. The main results, including the precise assumptions, are stated in the next section. They essentially give the error estimates

$$- O\Big(\varepsilon^{\frac{1}{8}} |\log \varepsilon|^{\frac{3}{16}}\Big) \leq u^\varepsilon - u \leq O\Big(\varepsilon^{\frac{1}{5}} |\log \varepsilon|^{\frac{1}{5}}\Big) \tag{1.3}$$

for the homogenization of (1.1), where the first inequality depends on a supplemental assumption on the law of H.

The difficulty in obtaining estimates on the fluctuations of $u^\varepsilon(x, t, \cdot) - u(x, t)$ is due in part to the fact that the dependence of u^ε on H is *highly singular*. Understanding how the solutions depend on the random environment is very challenging. Difficulties of a similar nature occur, for example, in the theory of first passage percolation (see Kesten [18] and Alexander [1]) and in the study of the fluctuations of the Lyapunov exponents for Brownian motion in Poissonian potentials (see Sznitman [33] and Wüthrich [36]). As far as we know, the only previous result on the oscillations of solutions of Hamilton-Jacobi equations in random media is found in the work of Rezakhanlou [30], who gave structural conditions on H in dimension $d = 1$ in which a central limit theorem holds. Such phenomena are not expected to appear in any dimension $d \geq 2$ (see Remark 4.2).

Our arguments rely crucially on adaptations of some of the probabilistic techniques of [18, 1], which are based on Azuma's inequality and the martingale method of bounded differences. This connection between first-passage percolation and the stochastic homogenization of (1.1), made explicit for the first time in this paper (as far as we know), arises naturally from an analogy between the passage time in percolation and solutions of the *metric problem* (see Remark A.3 below). Using arguments inspired from [18, 1], we prove exponential error estimate and obtain rates of convergence for the homogenization of the metric problem. Then, by quantifying the new proof of homogenization recently introduced by two of the authors [4], we transform the estimates for the metric problem into error estimates for the approximate cell problem (see (1.4) below).

The rate of convergence of *periodic* homogenization of Hamilton-Jacobi has been understood for some time and goes back to the work of Capuzzo-Dolcetta and Ishii [8], who proved that u^ε and u differ by at most $O(\varepsilon^{\frac{1}{3}})$. The periodic setting is much simpler to understand due to the fact that the cell problem has periodic solutions; that is, exact correctors exist. A quantitative version of the classical perturbed test function proof of homogenization due to Evans [12, 13] then yields the convergence rate. Our main results stated in Section 2 do not encompass the periodic or almost periodic settings, since obviously an almost periodic function cannot be embedded into the random setting in such a way that it satisfies a finite range of dependence condition. However, as we show, our arguments yield a uniform rate of convergence in the almost periodic setting (see Section 7).

In the stochastic environment, the situation is not only much more complicated but also qualitatively different from the periodic setting. It is, therefore, necessary to devise a new strategy, since the usual proof of periodic homogenization, which is based on exact correctors and can be quantified to yield a rate, does not generalize to random enviroments. Indeed, as Lions and Souganidis [22] demonstrated with an explicit example, exact correctors do not exist, in general, for stochastic

Hamiltonians. The only known proofs of the qualitative homogenization of Hamilton-Jacobi equations in the stationary ergodic setting are based on an application of the subadditive ergodic theorem to certain subadditive quantities (e.g., the m_μ's below) and then showing that these quantities control, in an appropriate way, the solutions of (1.1). In order to obtain a convergence rate for the homogenization, one is therefore left with the twofold task of quantifying both the limits given by the subadditive ergodic theorem as well as the precise way in which the subadditive quantities control the solutions of (1.1). The former must necessarily be handled by probabilistic methods and the latter by pde methods.

These are not mere technical difficulties. It turns out that, in the stochastic setting, the magnitude of the fluctuations of the solutions u^ε about their limit u must be separated into two separate regimes, which we refer to as *ballistic* and *sub-ballistic*, respectively (this terminology is borrowed from the probability literature, see, for example, Sznitman [34]). Intuitively, in the *ballistic* regime, the solutions are able to "feel" the random environment sufficiently quickly as $\varepsilon \to 0$. Then the mixing of the medium dominates, which results in an algebraic convergence rate. In the *sub-ballistic* regime, the dependence of the solutions on H is highly localized in the vicinity of points y in which $H(p,0,\omega)$ is close to its maximum. It is therefore the law of $H(p,0,\cdot)$ near its maximum that principally governs the rate at which homogenization occurs, and this rate may be arbitrarily slow without a further assumption on the law.

To give a more detailed overview of the approach, we start from the *approximate cell problem*

$$\delta v^\delta + H(p + Dv^\delta, y, \omega) = 0 \quad \text{in } \mathbb{R}^d, \tag{1.4}$$

which, for each fixed $p \in \mathbb{R}^d$ and $\delta > 0$, admits a unique bounded, uniformly continuous solution $v^\delta = v^\delta(y,\omega\,;p)$. The introduction of (1.4) in the context of the homogenization of Hamilton-Jacobi equations goes back to the original proof of periodic homogenization due to Lions, Papanicolaou and Varadhan [21]. It is well-known by now (see, e.g., [3]) that the homogenization of (1.1) to (1.2) is equivalent to (and the effective Hamiltonian $\overline{H}$ can be identified by) the limit

$$\lim_{\delta\to 0} -\delta v^\delta(0,\omega\,;p) = \overline{H}(p) \qquad \mathbb{P}\text{-a.s.} \tag{1.5}$$

Moreover, this equivalence is easy to quantify in the sense that an error estimate or convergence rate for (1.5) can be transformed into one for homogenization. We are therefore left with the task of quantifying the limit in (1.5).

The intuitive reason for the difficulty of arguing directly for the limit (1.5) in the random case is the complicated dependence of the v^δ's on H, which is both *singular* (information propagates only along characteristics and does not spread out) and *global* (information may travel far away in space, which is compounded by the lack of compactness). This problem is overcome in the stochastic setting by (i) imposing some kind of convexity assumption on H and (ii) using the subadditive structure of the metric problem (or its time-dependent analogue) to obtain an almost sure limit via the subadditive ergodic theorem. A comparison argument (introduced in [3, 4]) then yields that, in the ballistic regime (p's satisfying $\overline{H}(p) > \min \overline{H}$), the metric problem controls the limiting behavior of the $\delta v^\delta(0,\omega\,;p)$ as $\delta \to 0$. In the sub-ballistic regime, i.e., for p's belonging to the "flat spot" $\{\overline{H}(\cdot) = \min \overline{H}\}$, the limiting behavior of the δv^δ is driven primarily by the law of $H(p,0,\cdot)$ near its maximum value, as mentioned above, and it turns out to be the thickness of the tail of this distribution which governs the rate of homogenization.

We continue by introducing the *metric problem*: for each fixed μ large than a certain constant, which turns out te be $\min \overline{H}$, $x \in \mathbb{R}^d$ and $\omega \in \Omega$, there exists a unique nonnegative continuous solution $m_\mu = m_\mu(\cdot, x, \omega) : \mathbb{R}^d \to \mathbb{R}$ of

$$H(Dm_\mu, y, \omega) = \mu \quad \text{in } \mathbb{R}^d \setminus \{x\} \quad \text{and} \quad m_\mu(x, x, \omega) = 0. \tag{1.6}$$

In terms of control theory, the quantity $m_\mu(y, x, \omega)$ corresponds to a "cost" of transporting a particle from x to y in the medium ω. It thus has the properties of a metric and is analogous to the time constant in first-passage percolation (see Remark A.3).

The $m_\mu(\cdot, x, \omega)$'s are the maximal subsolutions of $H(Dw, y, \omega) \leq \mu$ in $\mathbb{R}^d$ subject to $w(x) = 0$, and this implies a subadditivity property. An easy application of the subadditive ergodic theorem (see [4]) then yields the existence of $\overline{m}_\mu \in C(\mathbb{R}^d)$ such that

$$\lim_{t \to \infty} t^{-1} m_\mu(ty, 0, \omega) = \overline{m}_\mu(y) \qquad \mathbb{P}\text{-a.s.} \tag{1.7}$$

The deterministic $\overline{m}_\mu$ can be identified as the unique nonnegative solution of

$$\overline{H}(D\overline{m}_\mu) = \mu \quad \text{in } \mathbb{R}^d \setminus \{0\} \quad \text{and} \quad \overline{m}_\mu(0) = 0,$$

and this provides another way of identifying $\overline{H}$, one level set at a time. (See Appendix A for more.)

The existence and some basic properties of the $m_\mu(\cdot, x, \omega)$'s have been known for some time (see, for example, Lions [20]). More recently a simple comparison argument was introduced in [4] which demonstrated that the $m_\mu(\cdot, x, \omega)$'s control the $\delta v^\delta(\cdot, \omega\, ; p)$'s from below for every $p \in \mathbb{R}^d$, and from above for p's in the ballistic regime. It follows from this analysis that the limit (1.7) implies the homogenization of (1.1). As we show here, this argument is constructive in the sense that a quantitative rate for the convergence of (1.7) implies a rate for (1.5).

The main advantage of the metric problem is that it is *localized*. Indeed, while changes in the medium may influence the value of δv^δ at far away points, the quantity $m_\mu(y, x, \omega)$ depends only on the values of $H(p, z, \omega)$ for z's satisfying $m_\mu(z, x, \omega) \leq m_\mu(y, x, \omega)$, which is a bounded set with diameter proportional to $|y - x|$. This localization (see Lemma A.5 and (A.28) below) permits us to use the independence of the medium by way of the martingale method of bounded differences and an application of Azuma's concentration inequality in a similar manner as in first-passage percolation [18].

In addition to quantifying the limit in (1.7) and hence in (1.5) for p's in the ballistic regime (and obtaining an almost sure, algebraic rate of convergence), we identify a necessary and sufficient condition (see (2.11) below) for an algebraic rate of convergence to hold for p's in the sub-ballistic regime. This follows from a direct analysis of the v^δ's using explicit comparison arguments. Merging the results for the ballistic and sub-ballistic regimes then yields, under assumption (2.11), an algebraic rate for (1.5) for all p's.

We remark that we do not expect our arguments to yield sharp error estimates or convergence rates for homogenization. Indeed, as we explain in Remark 4.2, this is related to outstanding conjectures on the fluctuations of the time constant in first passage percolation.

As mentioned above, the periodic homogenization of Hamilton-Jacobi equations was proved in [21]. This was simplified in [12] and subsequently extended to almost periodic media by Ishii [17]. The stochastic homogenization of convex first-order Hamilton-Jacobi equations was first proved in [32, 31] and, for viscous convex Hamilton-Jacobi equations, by Lions and Souganidis [23] and Kosygina, Rezakhanlou, and Varadhan [19]. Lions and Souganidis [22] obtained results on the existence and nonexistence of correctors in the random setting and introduced in [24] a more direct proof of homogenization in probability. Later, more direct proofs of almost sure homogenization, based on the metric problem, were given in [3, 4].

The metric problem has been used by Davini and Siconolfi [10, 11] to study some connections between the stochastic homogenization of Hamilton-Jacobi equations and weak KAM theory and, for periodic H's with special structure, by Oberman, Takei and Vladimirsky [29] and Luo, Yu and Zhao [25] in order to implement efficient numerical schemes for computing $\overline{H}$.

Outline of the paper. In the next section we give the precise assumptions and the statement of the main results. In Section 3 we review some preliminary results needed in our arguments. Controlling the fluctuations of the metric problem is the topic of Section 4. These estimates are combined with comparison arguments in Section 5 to obtain corresponding bounds for the approximate cell problem in the ballistic regime. The sub-ballistic regime is studied in the second part of Section 5, where we produce error estimates under an auxiliary hypothesis on the law of H as well as examples demonstrating that, without such a hypothesis, the rate may be arbitrarily slow. We complete the proof of the error estimates in Section 6 and give convergence rate for the homogenization of the time-dependent problem (1.1). Finally, in Section 7 we discuss the convergence rates of the homogenization of (1.4) and (1.1) in almost periodic media. In the appendices we summarize the fundamentals of the metric and approximate cell problems.

Notation and conventions. The symbols C and c denote positive constants which may vary from line to line and, unless otherwise indicated, depend only on the assumptions for H and other appropriate parameters (often an upper bound for $|p|$ or μ). For $s,t \in \mathbb{R}$, we write $s \wedge t := \min\{s,t\}$ and $s \vee t := \max\{s,t\}$. We denote the d-dimensional Euclidean space by $\mathbb{R}^d$, $\mathbb{Q}^d$ is the set of elements of $\mathbb{R}^d$ with rational coordinates, $\mathbb{N}$ is the set of natural numbers and $\mathbb{N}^* := \mathbb{N} \setminus \{0\}$. For each $y \in \mathbb{R}^d$, $|y|$ denotes the Euclidean length of y. If $E \subseteq \mathbb{R}^d$, then $|E|$ is the Lebesgue measure of E, $\operatorname{int} E$ the interior of E, $\overline{E}$ the closure of E and $\operatorname{conv} E$ the closure of the convex hull of E. For $r > 0$, we set $B(y,r) := \{x \in \mathbb{R}^d : |x-y| < r\}$ and $B_r := B(0,r)$. The distance between two subsets $U, V \subseteq \mathbb{R}^d$ is $\operatorname{dist}(U,V) = \inf\{|x-y| : x \in U,\, y \in V\}$. If $f : E \to \mathbb{R}$ then we denote $\operatorname{osc}_E f := \sup_E f - \inf_E f$. If K is a finite set, then $|K|$ is the number of elements of K. The set of Lipschitz functions on a set $U \subseteq \mathbb{R}^d$ is written $\operatorname{Lip}(U) = C^{0,1}(U)$ and we set $\mathcal{L} := \operatorname{Lip}(\mathbb{R}^d)$. The set of bounded and uniformly continuous real-valued functions on a metric space Y is denoted $\mathrm{BUC}(Y)$, and $\mathrm{USC}(Y)$ and $\mathrm{LSC}(Y)$ are respectively the sets of real-valued upper and lower semicontinuous functions on Y. The Borel σ-field on $\mathbb{R}^d$ is $\mathcal{B}$. If $\mathcal{G}_1$ and $\mathcal{G}_2$ are σ-fields on sets X_1 and X_2, respectively, then $\mathcal{G}_1 \otimes \mathcal{G}_2$ denotes the σ-field on $X_1 \times X_2$ generated by $\mathcal{G}_1 \times \mathcal{G}_2$. For a probability space $(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, \mathbb{P})$, we say that an event $A \in \mathcal{F}$ is of *full probability* if $\mathbb{P}[A] = 1$. We denote the indicator random variable of $A \in \mathcal{F}$ by $\mathbb{1}_A$. If $E \in \mathcal{B} \otimes \mathcal{F}$ and $x \in \mathbb{R}^d$, then $\mathbb{1}_{\{x \in E\}}$ is the indicator random variable of the event $\{\omega \in \Omega : (x,\omega) \in E\}$. If X is a random variable and $\mathcal{G} \subseteq \mathcal{F}$ is a σ-field, then $\mathbb{E}[X|\mathcal{G}]$ denotes the conditional expectation of X with respect to $\mathcal{G}$.

2. THE ASSUMPTIONS AND THE STATEMENT OF THE MAIN RESULTS

We introduce our hypotheses and state the main results of the paper.

2.1. The hypotheses.

Let $(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, \mathbb{P})$ be a probability space endowed with a group $(\tau_y)_{y \in \mathbb{R}^d}$ of $\mathcal{F}$-measurable, measure-preserving transformations $\tau_y : \Omega \to \Omega$. That is, we assume that, for every $x, y \in \mathbb{R}^d$ and $A \in \mathcal{F}$,

$$\mathbb{P}[\tau_y(A)] = \mathbb{P}[A] \quad \text{and} \quad \tau_{x+y} = \tau_x \circ \tau_y. \tag{2.1}$$

The Hamiltonian $H : \mathbb{R}^d \times \mathbb{R}^d \times \Omega \to \mathbb{R}$ is assumed to be measurable with respect to a $\mathcal{B} \otimes \mathcal{B} \otimes \mathcal{F}$. We write $H = H(p,y,\omega)$ and require that H be *stationary* in its dependence on (y,ω) with respect to the translation group $(\tau_y)_{y\in\mathbb{R}^d}$, that is, we assume that, for every $p, y, z \in \mathbb{R}^d$ and $\omega \in \Omega$,

$$H(p, y, \tau_z\omega) = H(p, y + z, \omega). \tag{2.2}$$

In order to state the finite range of dependence assumption, which means roughly that H is "i.i.d." in its spatial dependence, we let $\mathcal{G}(E)$ denote, for each $E \in \mathcal{B} \otimes \mathcal{F}$, the σ-field on Ω generated by elements of $\mathcal{F}$ of the form

$$\{\omega \in \Omega \,:\, H(p, x, \omega) \le \alpha\} \cap \{\omega \in \Omega \,:\, (x, \omega) \in E'\},$$

where $E' \in \mathcal{B} \otimes \mathcal{F}$ such that $E' \subseteq E$, $p, x \in \mathbb{R}^d$ and $\alpha \in \mathbb{R}$. Intuitively, $\mathcal{G}(E)$ consists of the information one learns by observing the Hamiltonian $H(p, x, \omega)$ for every $p \in \mathbb{R}^d$ and $x \in \{y \in \mathbb{R}^d : (y, \omega) \in E\}$. If $V \in \mathcal{B}$, then we put $\mathcal{G}(V) := \mathcal{G}(V \times \Omega)$ and we may henceforth assume, by restriction if necessary, that $\mathcal{F} = \mathcal{G}(\mathbb{R}^d)$. The finite range dependence hypothesis is then the requirement that there exists a positive $D > 0$ such that, for all $V, W \in \mathcal{B}$,

$$\text{if } \operatorname{dist}(V, W) \ge D \qquad \text{then} \qquad \mathcal{G}(V) \text{ and } \mathcal{G}(W) \text{ are independent.} \tag{2.3}$$

Of course, this implies that the group $(\tau_y)_{y\in\mathbb{R}^d}$ is ergodic, but is much stronger.

We continue with other structural hypotheses on H. We assume, for each $R > 0$, that the family

$$\{H(\cdot, \cdot, \omega) : \omega \in \Omega\} \quad \text{is precompact in } C(B_R \times \mathbb{R}^d) \tag{2.4}$$

and

$$\{H(\cdot, x, \omega) : \omega \in \Omega,\ x \in \mathbb{R}^d\} \quad \text{is bounded in } C^{0,1}(B_R). \tag{2.5}$$

We also require that H is *coercive* in p, uniformly in (y, ω), i.e.,

$$\lim_{|p|\to\infty} \operatorname*{ess\,inf}_{(y,\omega)\in\mathbb{R}^d\times\Omega} H(p, y, \omega) = +\infty. \tag{2.6}$$

We assume that H is slightly more than *level-set convex* in p. Precisely, we assume that there exists $\Lambda : \mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{R} \to \mathbb{R}$, which is nondecreasing in each variable, such that, for all $\mu, \nu \in \mathbb{R}$,

$$\Lambda(\mu, \nu) \le \mu \vee \nu \quad \text{and} \quad \Lambda(\mu, \nu) < \mu \vee \nu \quad \text{if } \nu \ne \mu, \tag{2.7}$$

and that H satisfies, for all $p, q, y \in \mathbb{R}^d$ and $\omega \in \Omega$,

$$H\left(\tfrac{1}{2}(p + q), y, \omega\right) \le \Lambda\big(H(p, y, \omega), H(q, y, \omega)\big). \tag{2.8}$$

Of course, H is convex if and only if (2.8) holds with $\Lambda(\mu, \nu) = \frac{1}{2}(\mu + \nu)$.

We also make the following assumptions regarding the shape of the level sets of H: for every $p, y \in \mathbb{R}^d$ and $\omega \in \Omega$,

$$H(p, y, \omega) \ge H(0, y, \omega) \qquad \text{and} \qquad \operatorname*{ess\,sup}_{\omega\in\Omega} H(0, 0, \omega) = 0. \tag{2.9}$$

From the point of view of optimal control theory, the fact that there is a common p_0 for all ω at which $H(\cdot, 0, \omega)$ attains its minimum provides some "controllability", i.e., upper and lower bounds on the length of optimal paths. We loose no generality by assuming $p_0 = 0$ and $\operatorname{ess\,sup}_{\omega\in\Omega} H(0, 0, \omega) = 0$. From our point of view, (2.9) controls the growth of the m_μ's (see (A.10) in Appendix A).

With the exception of Section 7, the hypotheses (2.1)–(2.9) described above are in force throughout the paper. For ease of reference, we write

$$\text{(2.1), (2.2), (2.3), (2.4), (2.5), (2.6), (2.7), (2.8) and (2.9) hold.} \tag{2.10}$$

Some of our results are proved under an extra assumption on the distribution of $H(0,0,\cdot)$ near its maximum. Precisely, this extra hypothesis is that there exist $\theta \geq 0$ and $c > 0$ such that, for every $0 < \lambda \leq c$,

$$\mathbb{P}\left[H(0,0,\cdot) > -\lambda\right] \geq c\lambda^{\theta}. \tag{2.11}$$

In light of (2.9), we see that, roughly speaking, (2.11) is a requirement that the event that $H(0,0,\cdot)$ is near its maximum is not *too unlikely.* For example, if $H(0,0,\cdot)$ attains its maximum on a set of positive probability, then of course (2.11) holds for $\theta = 0$.

2.2. **The main results.** Our first main result consists of error estimates for the limit (1.7), which measure the likelihood that the quantity $|m_\mu(y,0,\omega) - \overline{m}_\mu(y)|$ is large relative to $|y|$. The definition and basic properties of the metric problem (1.6) and its solutions m_μ and $\overline{m}_\mu$ are reviewed in Appendix A. The proof of Theorem 1 is given in Section 4.

Theorem 1 (Error estimates for the metric problem)**.** *Assume* (2.10)*. For each* $K > 0$*, there exists constants* $C_1, C_2 > 0$*, depending on* H *such that, for every* $0 < \mu \leq K$*,* $\lambda > 0$ *and* $|y| > D$*,*

$$\mathbb{P}\Big[\, m_\mu(y,0,\cdot) - \overline{m}_\mu(y) \leq -\lambda \Big] \leq \exp\left(-\frac{\mu\lambda^2}{C_1|y|}\right) \;, \tag{2.12}$$

and, if

$$\lambda \geq C_2\left(\frac{|y|^{\frac{1}{2}}}{\mu^{\frac{3}{2}}} + \frac{|y|^{\frac{2}{3}}}{\mu}\right)\left(\log\left(1 + \frac{|y|}{\mu}\right)\right)^{\frac{1}{2}}, \tag{2.13}$$

then

$$\mathbb{P}\Big[\, m_\mu(y,0,\cdot) - \overline{m}_\mu(y) \geq \lambda \Big] \leq \exp\left(-\frac{\mu\lambda^2}{4C_1|y|}\right). \tag{2.14}$$

The constant C_1 *is given in Proposition 4.1 and* $C_2 := 2C_{14}$*, where* C_{14} *is given in Lemma 4.10.*

The error estimates for the metric problem and a careful quantification of the comparison arguments introduced in [4], together with an analysis of the convergence on the flat spot under the additional assumption (2.11), yield the following error estimates for the limit (1.5). The basic properties of the solutions v^δ of the approximate cell problem (1.4) are outlined in Appendix B.

Theorem 2 (Error estimates for the approximate cell problem)**.** *Assume* (2.10)*. For each* $K > 0$*, there exists* $C_3 > 0$ *such that, for every* $|p| \leq K$*, the following hold:*

(i) *For every* $0 < \delta \leq \lambda \leq 1$*,*

$$\mathbb{P}\left[-\delta v^\delta(0,\cdot\,;p) \geq \overline{H}(p) + \lambda\right] \leq C_3\delta^{-3d}\exp\left(-\frac{\lambda^3}{C_3\delta}\right). \tag{2.15}$$

(ii) *If* $\overline{H}(p) > 0$ *and* $\lambda, \delta > 0$ *satisfy* $0 < \delta \leq 1$ *and*

$$\lambda \geq C_3\left(\overline{H}(p)^{-\frac{3}{2}}\delta^{\frac{1}{2}} + \overline{H}(p)^{-1}\delta^{\frac{1}{3}}\right)\left(1 + |\log\delta| + |\log\overline{H}(p)|\right)^{\frac{1}{2}}, \tag{2.16}$$

then

$$\mathbb{P}\left[-\delta v^\delta(0,\cdot\,;p) \leq \overline{H}(p) - \lambda\right] \leq C_3\delta^{-3d}\exp\left(-\frac{\overline{H}(p)\lambda^2}{C_3\delta}\right). \tag{2.17}$$

(iii) *Assume* (2.11)*. There exists* $c_1 > 0$ *such that, if* $\delta > 0$ *and* $0 < \lambda < c_1$ *satisfy*

$$\lambda \geq C_3 \delta^{\frac{1}{6}} |\log \delta|^{\frac{1}{4}}, \tag{2.18}$$

then

$$\mathbb{P}\left[-\delta v^\delta(0, \cdot\,; p) \leq \overline{H}(p) - \lambda\right] \leq C_3 \delta^{-3d} \exp\left(-\frac{1}{C_3}\left(\frac{\lambda^3}{\delta} \wedge \frac{\lambda^{d+\theta}}{\delta^d}\right)\right). \tag{2.19}$$

By a covering argument and an application of the Borel-Cantelli lemma, the error estimates contained in Theorem 2 yield $\mathbb{P}$-almost sure, local uniform rates of convergence for the limit (1.5).

Theorem 3 (A convergence rate for the approximate cell problem)**.** *Assume* (2.10)*. For all* $K > 0$*, there exists an event* $\Omega_1 \in \mathcal{F}$ *of full probability and a constant* $C_4 > 0$ *such that, for every* $|p| \leq K$ *and* $\omega \in \Omega_1$*, the following hold:*

(i) *For every* $R > 0$*,*

$$\limsup_{\delta \to 0} \sup_{y \in B_{R/\delta}} \frac{-\delta v^\delta(y, \omega\,; p) - \overline{H}(p)}{C_4 \delta^{\frac{1}{3}} |\log \delta|^{\frac{1}{3}}} \leq 1. \tag{2.20}$$

(ii) *If* $\overline{H}(p) > 0$*, then, for every* $R > 0$*,*

$$\liminf_{\delta \to 0} \inf_{y \in B_{R/\delta}} \frac{-\delta v^\delta(y, \omega\,; p) - \overline{H}(p)}{C_4 \overline{H}(p)^{-1} \delta^{\frac{1}{3}} |\log \delta|^{\frac{1}{2}}} \geq -1. \tag{2.21}$$

(iii) *If* (2.11) *holds and*

$$\alpha := \frac{1}{6} \wedge \frac{d}{d+\theta} \qquad \textit{and} \qquad \beta := \frac{1}{4}\,, \tag{2.22}$$

then, for every $R > 0$*,*

$$\liminf_{\delta \to 0} \inf_{y \in B_{R/\delta}} \frac{-\delta v^\delta(y, \omega\,; p) - \overline{H}(p)}{C_4 \delta^{\alpha} |\log \delta|^{\beta}} \geq -1. \tag{2.23}$$

The previous two results are proved in Section 5, where we also give a converse to Theorem 3(iii), which states that the extra assumption (2.11) is actually necessary for an algebraic rate of convergence to hold at $p = 0$. Indeed, keeping in mind that our assumptions imply that $\overline{H}(0) = 0$, we prove in Proposition 5.7 that, roughly, if (2.11) is false, then, for every exponent $\eta > 0$,

$$\liminf_{\delta \to 0} \frac{-\delta v^\delta(0, \omega\,; 0)}{\delta^\eta} = -\infty \quad \mathbb{P}-\text{a.s.} \tag{2.24}$$

Furthermore, for any modulus function ρ, we construct examples of H's satisfying (2.10) for which

$$\liminf_{\delta \to 0} \frac{-\delta v^\delta(0, \omega\,; 0)}{\rho(\delta)} \leq -1 \quad \mathbb{P}-\text{a.s.} \tag{2.25}$$

It is therefore necessary to impose, in addition to (2.10), some assumption on the distribution of $H(0, 0, \cdot)$ near its maximum to obtain a rate for the limit (1.5) at $p = 0$.

We next present our main quantitative results for the homogenization of (1.1). Here u^ε and u denote, respectively, the unique solutions of (1.1) and (1.2) subject to the initial condition $u^\varepsilon(\cdot, 0) = u(\cdot, 0) = u_0 \in \mathcal{L}$, which are bounded and Lipschitz continuous on $\mathbb{R}^d \times [0, T]$ for each $T > 0$. We begin with exponential estimates for the probability that $|u^\varepsilon(x, t) - u(x, t)|$ is large.

Theorem 4 (Error estimates for homogenization)**.** *Assume* (2.10)*. For each $K > 0$, there exists a constant $C_5 > 0$ such that, for every $u_0 \in C^{0,1}(\mathbb{R}^d)$ satisfying $\|u_0\|_{C^{0,1}(\mathbb{R}^d)} \leq K$ and $T \geq 1$, the following hold:*

(i) *For every $0 < \varepsilon \leq 1$ and $\lambda \geq C_5 \varepsilon^{\frac{1}{3}}$,*

$$\mathbb{P}\left[\inf_{x \in B_T} \inf_{0 \leq t \leq T} (u^\varepsilon(x,t,\cdot) - u(x,t)) \leq -\lambda T\right] \leq C_5 T^{6d} \lambda^{9d} \varepsilon^{-6d} \exp\left(-\frac{T\lambda^5}{C_5 \varepsilon}\right). \tag{2.26}$$

(ii) *If* (2.11) *holds, then, for every $0 < \varepsilon \leq 1$ and*

$$\lambda \geq C_5 \varepsilon^{\frac{1}{8}} |\log \varepsilon|^{\frac{3}{16}}, \tag{2.27}$$

$$\mathbb{P}\left[\sup_{x \in B_T} \sup_{0 \leq t \leq T} (u^\varepsilon(x,t,\cdot) - u(x,t)) \geq \lambda T\right] \\ \leq C_5 T^{6d} \lambda^{9d} \varepsilon^{-6d} \exp\left(-\frac{1}{C_5}\left(\frac{T\lambda^5}{\varepsilon} \wedge \frac{T^d \lambda^{3d+\theta}}{\varepsilon^d}\right)\right). \tag{2.28}$$

Our final main result is an almost sure, locally uniform, algebraic rate of convergence for the homogenization of (1.1).

Theorem 5 (Convergence rate for homogenization)**.** *Assume* (2.10) *and let $K > 0$. There exists an event $\Omega_2 \in \mathcal{F}$ of full probability and a constant $C_6 > 0$ such that, for every $\omega \in \Omega_2$ and $u_0 \in C^{0,1}(\mathbb{R}^d)$ with $\|u_0\|_{C^{0,1}(\mathbb{R}^d)} \leq K$, the following hold:*

(i) *For every $T \geq 1$,*

$$\liminf_{\varepsilon \to 0} \inf_{x \in B_T} \inf_{0 < t \leq T} \frac{u^\varepsilon(x,t,\omega) - u(x,t)}{\varepsilon^{\frac{1}{5}} |\log \varepsilon|^{\frac{1}{5}}} \geq -C_6 T. \tag{2.29}$$

(ii) *If* (2.11) *holds, α and β are as in* (2.22) *and*

$$\overline{a} := \frac{\alpha}{1+2\alpha} = \frac{1}{8} \wedge \frac{d}{3d+\theta} \qquad \text{and} \qquad \overline{b} := \frac{\beta}{1+2\alpha} = \frac{3}{16} \vee \frac{d+\theta}{4(3d+\theta)}, \tag{2.30}$$

then, for every $T \geq 1$,

$$\limsup_{\varepsilon \to 0} \sup_{x \in B_T} \sup_{0 < t \leq T} \frac{u^\varepsilon(x,t,\omega) - u(x,t)}{\varepsilon^{\overline{a}} |\log \varepsilon|^{\overline{b}}} \leq C_6 T. \tag{2.31}$$

Remark 2.1. We discuss later the sharpness of the exponent $\overline{a}$ and $\overline{b}$. Let us point out for the moment that, in the special case that H is positively homogeneous of order one in p, i.e., for every $t \geq 0$, $p, y \in \mathbb{R}^d$ and $\omega \in \Omega$,

$$H(tp, y, \omega) = tH(p, y, \omega), \tag{2.32}$$

the condition (2.11) is clearly satisfied for $\theta = 0$, and thus Theorem 5 gives a rate of $O\big(\varepsilon^{\frac{1}{8}} |\log \varepsilon|^{\frac{3}{16}}\big)$ for homogenization. Moreover, this rate can be improved since (2.32) implies that $\overline{H}$ is also positively homogeneous of order one, or equivalently that $\mu \mapsto \overline{m}_\mu(y)$ is positively homogeneous of order one, that is, for all $\mu > 0$, $x, y \in \mathbb{R}^d$ and $\omega \in \Omega$,

$$m_\mu(y, x, \omega) = \mu m_1(y, x, \omega).$$

Thus the fluctuations of $m_\mu - \overline{m}_\mu$ are proportional to μ, and this prevents (2.14) from degenerating as $\mu \to 0$. Indeed, we find that (2.14) holds for every $\lambda > 0$ satisfying

$$\lambda \geq C_2 \mu |y|^{\frac{2}{3}} \left(\log(1 + |y|)\right)^{\frac{1}{2}}$$

instead of the more restrictive (2.13). One may propogate this improvement through the rest of the arguments in the paper to find, for example, that (2.23) holds for $\alpha = \frac{1}{3}$ and $\beta = \frac{1}{2}$, and (2.31) for $\overline{a} = \frac{1}{5}$ and $\overline{b} = \frac{3}{10}$. The same observation holds for Hamiltonians which are positively homogeneous of any positive order, and we expect that other such improvements are possible for H's with special structure.

3. Preliminaries

We continue with some elementary remarks regarding our assumptions. First, it is easy to check that (2.9) implies that, for each ω belonging to a set of full probability,

$$\sup_{y\in\mathbb{R}^d} H(0,y,\omega) = 0. \tag{3.1}$$

Indeed, that the left side of (3.1) is almost surely constant is a consequence of the ergodic hypothesis and the translation invariance of this quantity. That this constant must be zero follows from the continuity of H and the fact that (2.9) implies that $\mathbb{P}\left[\sup_{y\in\mathbb{Q}^d} H(0,y,\cdot) \leq 0\right] = 1$. Similar observations can be made for the sups and infs of other stationary random variables.

Throughout the paper, all differential inequalities are taken to hold in the viscosity sense. Readers not familiar with the fundamentals of the theory of viscosity solutions should consult standard references such as [9, 6].

3.1. A discretization scheme.

In the proof of Proposition 4.1, below, it is useful to employ a discretization scheme which for convenience we describe here.

As we discuss in more detail in Appendix A, the *reachable set* is defined for each $\mu, t > 0$ and $x \in \mathbb{R}^d$ by

$$\mathcal{R}_{\mu,t}(x) := \left\{ (y,\omega) \in \mathbb{R}^d \times \Omega \,:\, m_\mu(y,x,\omega) \leq t \right\},$$

and we also set

$$\mathcal{R}^\omega_{\mu,t}(x) := \left\{ y \in \mathbb{R}^d \,:\, (y,\omega) \in \mathcal{R}_{\mu,t}(x) \right\}, \quad \mathcal{R}_{\mu,t} := \mathcal{R}_{\mu,t}(0) \quad \text{and} \quad \mathcal{R}^\omega_{\mu,t} := \mathcal{R}^\omega_{\mu,t}(0) \tag{3.2}$$

We also define, for each $\mu > 0$, the filtration $\{\mathcal{F}_{\mu,t}\}_{t\geq 0}$ by $\mathcal{F}_{\mu,0} := \{\Omega, \emptyset\}$ and, for every $t > 0$,

$$\mathcal{F}_{\mu,t} := \mathcal{G}\left(\mathcal{R}_{\mu,t}\right). \tag{3.3}$$

That $\mathcal{F}_{\mu,t}$ is increasing in t follows from the fact that $\mathcal{G}(E)$ is monotone with respect to E, according to its definition.

We next describe the discretization scheme, which allows us to essentially condition on the identity of the reachable set $\mathcal{R}_{\mu,t}$ and apply the independence assumption (2.3) in the form of Lemma 3.1, below.

Define, for every $r > 0$,

$$\mathcal{K}_r := \left\{ A \in \mathcal{B} \,:\, A = \overline{A} \subseteq \overline{B}_r \right\}$$

and note that $\mathcal{K}_r$ is a compact metric space under the *Hausdorff distance* (c.f. Munkres [28]), which is defined by

$$\operatorname{dist}_H(E,F) := \inf_{x\in E}\sup_{y\in F} |x-y| \vee \inf_{y\in F}\sup_{x\in E} |x-y| = \inf\left\{ \varepsilon > 0 : E \subseteq F + B_\varepsilon \text{ and } F \subseteq E + B_\varepsilon \right\}.$$

Note that, for every $E, F \in \mathcal{B}$,

$$\operatorname{dist}_H(E,F) \geq \operatorname{dist}\left(E, \mathbb{R}^d \setminus F\right). \tag{3.4}$$

Fix a small $\delta > 0$. Then, by the compactness of $\mathcal{K}_r$, there exists $\ell = \ell(\delta, d, r) \in \mathbb{N}$ and a disjoint partition $\Gamma_1, \ldots, \Gamma_\ell \subseteq \mathcal{K}_r$ of $\mathcal{K}_r$ into Borel subsets with $\operatorname{diam}_H(\Gamma_i) \leq \delta$. Let $K_i \in \mathcal{B}$ be the closure of the union of the elements of Γ_i. Then for each $A \in \mathcal{K}_r$, there exists a unique $1 \leq i \leq \ell$ such that $A \in \Gamma_i$, which in turn implies that $A \subseteq K_i$. Also define

$$\widetilde{K}_i := K_i + B_D$$

so that $\operatorname{dist}(K_i, \mathbb{R}^d \setminus \widetilde{K}_i) = D$. We have arranged things so that, for every $1 \leq i \leq \ell$,

$$\mathcal{G}(K_i) \quad \text{and} \quad \mathcal{G}\left(\mathbb{R}^d \backslash \widetilde{K}_i\right) \quad \text{are independent} \tag{3.5}$$

and, for each $A \in \mathcal{K}_r$ and $1 \leq i \leq \ell$,

$$\text{if } A \in \Gamma_i \ , \qquad \text{then} \qquad A \subseteq K_i \subseteq \widetilde{K}_i \subseteq A + B_{D+\delta}. \tag{3.6}$$

We remark that ℓ, the partition $\{\Gamma_i\}$ as well as the K_i's depend on r and δ, but for convenience we do not explicitly display this dependence.

The following lemma captures the intuitively obvious assertion that the behavior of the medium inside the set $\mathcal{R}_{\mu,t}$, conditioned on the event that $\mathcal{R}_{\mu,t} \in \Gamma_i$ (and hence $\mathcal{R}_{\mu,t} \subseteq K_i$) is independent of the behavior of $m_\mu(y, \widetilde{K}_i, \omega)$, where we recall that the latter is defined in (A.30) and is independent of $\mathcal{G}(K_i)$ by (A.34). Roughly, it contains a processed form of independence assumption which is particularly well-suited to our needs in the proof of Proposition 4.1.

Lemma 3.1. *For each $1 \leq i \leq \ell$, $t > 0$ and $A \in \mathcal{F}_{\mu,t}$,*

$$\mathbb{1}_{A \cap \{\mathcal{R}_{\mu,t} \in \Gamma_i\}} \quad \textit{is} \ \ \mathcal{G}(K_i)\textit{-measurable.} \tag{3.7}$$

Moreover,

$$\mathbb{E}\left[m_\mu\big(y, \widetilde{K}_i, \cdot\big) \mathbb{1}_{\{\mathcal{R}_{\mu,t} \in \Gamma_i\}} \,\Big|\, \mathcal{F}_{\mu,t} \right] = \mathbb{E}\left[m_\mu\big(y, \widetilde{K}_i, \cdot\big) \right] \mathbb{1}_{\{\mathcal{R}_{\mu,t} \in \Gamma_i\}}. \tag{3.8}$$

Proof. It suffices to show (3.7) for A of the form

$$A = \{\omega \in \Omega \,:\, H(p, x, \omega) \leq \alpha\} \cap \{\omega \in \Omega \,:\, (x, \omega) \in E\}, \tag{3.9}$$

where $E \in \mathcal{B} \otimes \mathcal{F}$ is such that $E \subseteq \mathcal{R}_{\mu,t}$, $p, x \in \mathbb{R}^d$ and $\alpha \in \mathbb{R}$, since such events A generate $\mathcal{F}_{\mu,t}$. Recall the definition of m_μ^K in (A.24) for nonempty and closed $K \subseteq \mathbb{R}^d$ and the fact from (A.27) that, assuming $0 \in K$, we have

$$m_\mu^K(y, 0, \omega) \geq t \quad \text{on } \partial K \qquad \text{implies that} \qquad \mathcal{R}_{\mu,t}^\omega = \left\{ y \in \mathbb{R}^d \,:\, m_\mu^K(y, 0, \omega) \leq t \right\}. \tag{3.10}$$

Due to (3.6) and (3.10),

$$\begin{aligned} &A \cap \left\{ \omega \in \Omega \,:\, \mathcal{R}_{\mu,t}^\omega \in \Gamma_i \right\} \\ &\qquad = \left\{ \omega \in \Omega \,:\, H(p, x, \omega) \leq \alpha \ , \ (x, \omega) \in E, \ \{m_\mu^{K_i}(\cdot, \omega) \leq t\} \in \Gamma_i \text{ and } m_\mu^{K_i}(x, \omega) \leq t \right\} \ . \end{aligned}$$

If $x \notin K_i$, then it is impossible that both $(x, \omega) \in E \subseteq \mathcal{R}_{\mu,t}$ and $\{m_\mu^{K_i}(\cdot, \omega) \leq t\} \in \Gamma_i$ by (3.10). Thus this set is empty (and hence belongs to $\mathcal{G}(K_i)$) in the case that $x \notin K_i$ or $\{m_\mu^{K_i}(\cdot, \omega) \leq t\} \notin \Gamma_i$. It is also $\mathcal{G}(K_i)$-measurable if $x \in K_i$ and $\{m_\mu^{K_i}(\cdot, \omega) \leq t\} \in \Gamma_i$ because in this case $E \subseteq \mathcal{R}_{\mu,t} \subseteq K_i \times \Omega$ and the map $\omega \mapsto m^{K_i}(x, \omega)$ is $\mathcal{G}(K_i)-$measurable. This confirms (3.7).

According to (3.5), (A.34), and (3.7), for each $A \in \mathcal{F}_{\mu,t}$, the event $A \cap \{\mathcal{R}_{\mu,t} \in \Gamma_i\}$ is independent of the random variable $m_\mu\big(y, \widetilde{K}_i, \cdot\big)$. Hence for each $A \in \mathcal{F}_{\mu,t}$,

$$\mathbb{E}\left[m_\mu\big(y, \widetilde{K}_i, \cdot\big) \mathbb{1}_{A \cap \{\mathcal{R}_{\mu,t} \in \Gamma_i\}} \right] = \mathbb{E}\left[m_\mu\big(y, \widetilde{K}_i, \cdot\big) \right] \mathbb{P}\left[A \cap \{\mathcal{R}_{\mu,t} \in \Gamma_i\} \right].$$

The claim (3.8) now follows. □

3.2. **Some preliminary results.** To control the oscillations of solutions of the metric problem around their means, we use the "martingale method of bounded differences" based on the Azuma inequality [5]. See McDiarmind [27] and Alon and Spencer [2] for an overview of this probabilistic method, as well as a proof of Azuma's inequality, which is stated as follows.

Proposition 3.2 (Azuma's inequality). *Let* $\{X_k\}_{k\in\mathbb{N}}$ *be a discrete martingale with* $X_0 \equiv 0$. *Assume that there exists a constant* $A > 0$ *such that, for each* $k \in \mathbb{N}$,

$$\operatorname*{ess\,sup}_{\Omega} |X_{k+1} - X_k| \leq A.$$

Then, for each $\lambda > 0$ *and* $N \geq 1$,

$$\mathbb{P}\left[|X_N| > \lambda\right] \leq \exp\left(-\frac{\lambda^2}{2A^2N}\right).$$

We next state Hammersley's generalization of Fekete's lemma on subadditive functions. For a proof, see [15, Theorem 2].

Lemma 3.3 (Hammersley-Fekete lemma). *Suppose that* $\xi > 0$ *and* $f : [\xi, \infty) \to \mathbb{R}$ *satisfies, for every* $s, t \geq \xi$,

$$f(s+t) \geq f(s) + f(t) - \Delta(s+t),$$

where $\Delta : [\xi, \infty) \to \mathbb{R}$ *is nondecreasing such that*

$$\int_{\xi}^{\infty} \frac{\Delta(s)}{s^2}\, ds < \infty.$$

Then $\tau := \lim_{s\to\infty} f(s)/s \in (-\infty, \infty]$ *exists and, for every* $t > \xi$,

$$\tau \geq \frac{f(t)}{t} + \frac{\Delta(t)}{t} - 4\int_{2t}^{\infty} \frac{\Delta(s)}{s^2}\, ds.$$

Several of our arguments rely on the comparison principle for viscosity solutions of first-order equations, typically in the following form (see [9] or [6] for a proof).

Proposition 3.4. *Let* $G \in C(\mathbb{R}^d \times \mathbb{R}^d)$, U *be a bounded open subset of* $\mathbb{R}^d$, *and* $u, -v \in \mathrm{USC}(\overline{U})$ *and* $f \in C(U)$ *satisfy*

$$G(Du, y) < f(x) < G(Dv, y) \quad \text{in } U.$$

Then

$$\sup_U (u - v) = \max_{\partial U} (u - v).$$

We conclude with the following helpful lemma, which is due to the level set convexity of H and is useful for checking whether $u \in \mathcal{L}$ is a subsolution of the equation $H(Du, y, \omega) \leq \mu$ for $\mu \in \mathbb{R}$. A simple proof can be found in [4].

Lemma 3.5. *Let* $\mu \in \mathbb{R}$, $\omega \in \Omega$ *and* $U \subseteq \mathbb{R}^d$ *be open. Then* $u \in \mathrm{USC}(U)$ *is a viscosity solution of*

$$H(Du, y, \omega) \leq \mu \quad \text{in } U \tag{3.11}$$

if and only if u *is locally Lipschitz in* U *and satisfies* (3.11) *almost everywhere in* U.

A commonly used fact in the theory of viscosity solutions is that the supremum (infimum) of a family of subsolutions (supersolutions) is a subsolution (supersolution), see [9]. Observe that, in light of Lemma 3.5, the infimum of a family of subsolutions of (3.11) is a subsolution and, in particular, the infimum of a family of solutions of (3.5) is a solution.

4. Error estimates for the metric problem

Here we study the fluctuations of m_μ about their homogenized limit $\overline{m}_\mu$. The ultimate goal is to obtain the exponential error estimates contained in the statement of Theorem 1. We assume that H satisfies (2.10), but we do not assume (2.11). We also fix $K \geq 1$ and

$$0 < \mu \leq K. \tag{4.1}$$

The positive constants in our estimates denoted by $C, C_1, C_2, \ldots$ and $c, c_1, c_2, \ldots$ depend only on K, the underlying dimension d and the assumptions for H. Several of our estimates depend on a lower bound for μ, and since we must keep track of this dependency, we explicitly display dependence on μ. We allow the constants C and c to vary from line to line.

There are essentially two steps in the proof of Theorem 1. The first is to obtain exponential error estimates controlling the oscillations of $m_\mu(y, 0, \cdot)$ about its mean

$$M_\mu(y) := \mathbb{E}\left[m_\mu(y, 0, \cdot)\right].$$

The second step, which is more involved, is to estimate the difference between the deterministic quantities $M_\mu(y)$ and $\overline{m}_\mu(y)$.

4.1. **Controlling the oscillations around the means.** We begin by estimating, for large $|y|$, the probability that $m_\mu(y, 0, \cdot)$ is far from its mean. We use an argument inspired by the pioneering work of Kesten [18] in the theory of first-passage percolation, who introduced a martingale method based on Azuma's concentration inequality. We also benefit with some very elegant simplifications of the argument due recently to Zhang [37].

Notice that, unlike in percolation theory (or its continuum analogue), our Hamiltonian is not assumed to be positively homogeneous. In this generality, it is necessary to keep track of the dependence of the estimates on a lower bound for μ. We recall that, in view of Proposition A.2(iv) and (4.1), there exist constants

$$0 < c\mu \leq l_\mu \leq L_\mu \leq C \tag{4.2}$$

such that, for every $x, y \in \mathbb{R}^d$,

$$l_\mu |y - x| \leq m_\mu(y, x, \omega) \leq L_\mu |y - x|. \tag{4.3}$$

In the control theory interpretation (see Remark A.3), this important estimate, which we use many times below, provides upper and lower bounds on the lengths of optimal paths connecting two points $x, y \in \mathbb{R}^d$.

Proposition 4.1. *For each $\lambda > 0$ and $|y| > D$,*

$$\mathbb{P}\Big[\ |m_\mu(y, 0, \cdot) - M_\mu(y)| > \lambda\Big] \leq \exp\left(-\frac{\mu\lambda^2}{C_1 |y|}\right), \tag{4.4}$$

where $C_1 > 0$ is given explicitly by $C_1 := 8\mu l_\mu^{-1} L_\mu^2 (2l_\mu + L_\mu) D \leq 24\mu l_\mu^{-1} L_\mu^3 D \leq C L_\mu D$.

Proof. Fix $y \in \mathbb{R}^d$ with $|y| > D$ and define

$$T := L_\mu |y| \qquad \text{and} \qquad r := T/l_\mu = L_\mu |y|/l_\mu \tag{4.5}$$

so that (see (A.18)), for every $\omega \in \Omega$,

$$\mathcal{R}^\omega_{\mu,T} \subseteq \overline{B}_r. \tag{4.6}$$

We employ the discretization scheme, for fixed $\delta > 0$, as described in Subsection 3.1, with the notation introduced there, and we define a continuous-time martingale $\{X_t\}_{t\geq 0}$ adapted to $\{\mathcal{F}_{\mu,t}\}_{t\geq 0}$ by setting, for each $t \geq 0$,

$$X_t := \mathbb{E}\big[m_\mu(y,0,\cdot)\,|\,\mathcal{F}_{\mu,t}\big] - M_\mu(y). \tag{4.7}$$

Due to $\mathcal{F}_{\mu,0} = \{\varnothing, \Omega\}$, $T = L_\mu|y|$ and (A.29),

$$X_0 \equiv 0 \qquad \text{and} \qquad X_t(\omega) \equiv m_\mu(y,0,\omega) - M_\mu(y) \quad \text{for every } t \geq T. \tag{4.8}$$

Our goal is to apply Azuma's inequality in order to estimate the oscillations of X_T. We must first obtain an estimate of the form

$$\operatorname*{ess\,sup}_{\omega\in\Omega} |X_s(\omega) - X_t(\omega)| \leq A + B|s-t|.$$

We begin with the observation that, owing to (A.29), for every $0 < t \leq s$,

$$\mathbb{E}\big[m_\mu(y,0,\cdot)\mathbb{1}_{\{y\in\mathcal{R}_{\mu,t}\}}\,|\,\mathcal{F}_{\mu,s}\big] = m_\mu(y,0,\cdot)\mathbb{1}_{\{y\in\mathcal{R}_{\mu,t}\}} \tag{4.9}$$

and, hence,

$$X_s - X_t = \mathbb{E}\big[m_\mu(y,0,\cdot)\mathbb{1}_{\{y\notin\mathcal{R}_{\mu,t}\}}\,|\,\mathcal{F}_{\mu,s}\big] - \mathbb{E}\big[m_\mu(y,0,\cdot)\mathbb{1}_{\{y\notin\mathcal{R}_{\mu,t}\}}\,|\,\mathcal{F}_{\mu,t}\big]. \tag{4.10}$$

Using (A.20), we find that

$$\begin{aligned} m_\mu(y,0,\omega)\mathbb{1}_{\{y\notin\mathcal{R}_{\mu,t}\}}(\omega) &= \min_{z\in\partial\mathcal{R}^\omega_{\mu,t}} \left(m_\mu(y,z,\omega) + m_\mu(z,0,\omega)\right)\mathbb{1}_{\{y\notin\mathcal{R}_{\mu,t}\}}(\omega) \\ &= \left(m_\mu(y,\mathcal{R}^\omega_{\mu,t},\omega) + t\right)\mathbb{1}_{\{y\notin\mathcal{R}_{\mu,t}\}}(\omega) = m_\mu(y,\mathcal{R}^\omega_{\mu,t},\omega) + t\mathbb{1}_{\{y\notin\mathcal{R}_{\mu,t}\}}(\omega) \end{aligned}$$

and, since $\{y\notin\mathcal{R}_{\mu,t}\}\in\mathcal{F}_{\mu,t}$, we may simplify (4.10) to write

$$X_s - X_t = \mathbb{E}\big[m_\mu(y,\mathcal{R}_{\mu,t},\cdot)\,|\,\mathcal{F}_{\mu,s}\big] - \mathbb{E}\big[m_\mu(y,\mathcal{R}_{\mu,t},\cdot)\,|\,\mathcal{F}_{\mu,t}\big]. \tag{4.11}$$

Clearly for every $0 < t \leq s$,

$$m_\mu(y,\mathcal{R}^\omega_{\mu,s},\omega) \leq m_\mu(y,\mathcal{R}^\omega_{\mu,t},\omega) \leq (s-t) + m_\mu(y,\mathcal{R}^\omega_{\mu,s},\omega).$$

Combining the last two lines, we obtain

$$|X_s - X_t| \leq (s-t) + \big|\mathbb{E}\left[m_\mu(y,\mathcal{R}_{\mu,s},\cdot)\,|\,\mathcal{F}_{\mu,s}\right] - \mathbb{E}\left[m_\mu(y,\mathcal{R}_{\mu,t},\cdot)\,|\,\mathcal{F}_{\mu,t}\right]\big|. \tag{4.12}$$

We next use the discretization scheme to estimate $\mathbb{E}\left[m_\mu(y,\mathcal{R}_{\mu,t},\cdot)\,|\,\mathcal{F}_{\mu,t}\right]$ by approximating the integral represented by the expectation as a sum of characteristic functions. With K_i, $\widetilde{K}_i$ and Γ_i as described there, observe that, by (3.6),

$$m_\mu(y,\widetilde{K}_i,\cdot)\mathbb{1}_{\{\mathcal{R}_{\mu,t}\in\Gamma_i\}} \leq m_\mu(y,\mathcal{R}_{\mu,t},\cdot)\mathbb{1}_{\{\mathcal{R}_{\mu,t}\in\Gamma_i\}} \leq \Big(L_\mu(D+\delta) + m_\mu(y,\widetilde{K}_i,\cdot)\Big)\mathbb{1}_{\{\mathcal{R}_{\mu,t}\in\Gamma_i\}}. \tag{4.13}$$

Taking the conditional expectation of (4.13) with respect to $\mathcal{F}_{\mu,t}$ and applying (3.8), we get

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}\left[m_\mu(y,\widetilde{K}_i,\cdot)\right]\mathbb{1}_{\{\mathcal{R}_{\mu,t}\in\Gamma_i\}} &\leq \mathbb{E}\left[m_\mu(y,\mathcal{R}_{\mu,t},\cdot)\mathbb{1}_{\{\mathcal{R}_{\mu,t}\in\Gamma_i\}}\,\middle|\,\mathcal{F}_{\mu,t}\right] \\ &\leq \Big(L_\mu(D+\delta) + \mathbb{E}\left[m_\mu(y,\widetilde{K}_i,\cdot)\right]\Big)\mathbb{1}_{\{\mathcal{R}_{\mu,t}\in\Gamma_i\}} \end{aligned} \tag{4.14}$$

Since $\{\Gamma_i\}$ is a disjoint partition of $\mathcal{K}_r$, we also have

$$\mathbb{E}\left[m_\mu(y,\mathcal{R}_{\mu,t},\cdot)\,\middle|\,\mathcal{F}_{\mu,t}\right] = \sum_{i,j=1}^{\ell} \mathbb{E}\left[m_\mu(y,\mathcal{R}_{\mu,t},\cdot)\mathbb{1}_{\{\mathcal{R}_{\mu,t}\in\Gamma_i\}}\,\middle|\,\mathcal{F}_{\mu,t}\right]\mathbb{1}_{\{\mathcal{R}_{\mu,s}\in\Gamma_j\}}. \tag{4.15}$$

Multiplying (4.14) by $\mathbb{1}_{\{\mathcal{R}_{\mu,s}\in\Gamma_j\}}$ and summing over the indices i and j yields, in light of (4.15),

$$0 \le \mathbb{E}\left[m_\mu(y,\mathcal{R}_{\mu,t},\cdot)\,\middle|\,\mathcal{F}_{\mu,t}\right] - \sum_{i,j=1}^{\ell} \mathbb{E}\left[m_\mu(y,\widetilde{K}_i,\cdot)\right] \mathbb{1}_{\{\mathcal{R}_{\mu,t}\in\Gamma_i\}}\mathbb{1}_{\{\mathcal{R}_{\mu,s}\in\Gamma_j\}} \le L_\mu(D+\delta). \tag{4.16}$$

In the same way, after interchanging s for t and j for i, we also obtain

$$0 \le \mathbb{E}\left[m_\mu(y,\mathcal{R}_{\mu,s},\cdot)\,\middle|\,\mathcal{F}_{\mu,s}\right] - \sum_{i,j=1}^{\ell} \mathbb{E}\left[m_\mu(y,\widetilde{K}_j,\cdot)\right] \mathbb{1}_{\{\mathcal{R}_{\mu,t}\in\Gamma_i\}}\mathbb{1}_{\{\mathcal{R}_{\mu,s}\in\Gamma_j\}} \le L_\mu(D+\delta). \tag{4.17}$$

It follows that

$$\begin{aligned} &\left|\mathbb{E}\left[m_\mu(y,\mathcal{R}_{\mu,s},\cdot)\,|\,\mathcal{F}_{\mu,s}\right] - \mathbb{E}\left[m_\mu(y,\mathcal{R}_{\mu,t},\cdot)\,|\,\mathcal{F}_{\mu,t}\right]\right| \\ &\qquad \le L_\mu(D+\delta) + \sum_{i,j=1}^{\ell} \left|\mathbb{E}\left[m_\mu(y,\widetilde{K}_i,\cdot) - m_\mu(y,\widetilde{K}_j,\cdot)\right]\right| \mathbb{1}_{\{\mathcal{R}_{\mu,t}\in\Gamma_i\}}\mathbb{1}_{\{\mathcal{R}_{\mu,s}\in\Gamma_j\}}. \end{aligned} \tag{4.18}$$

If, for some $i,j=1,\ldots,\ell$, there exists ω belonging to the event that $\mathcal{R}^\omega_{\mu,t}\in\Gamma_i$ and $\mathcal{R}^\omega_{\mu,s}\in\Gamma_j$, then

$$\operatorname{dist}_H\left(\widetilde{K}_i,\widetilde{K}_j\right) \le \operatorname{dist}_H\left(K_i,K_j\right) \le \operatorname{dist}_H\left(\mathcal{R}^\omega_{\mu,t},\mathcal{R}^\omega_{\mu,s}\right) + 2\delta \le \frac{(s-t)}{l_\mu} + 2\delta.$$

Using (A.11), we conclude that, for every $i,j=1,\ldots,\ell$,

$$\left|\mathbb{E}\left[m_\mu(y,\widetilde{K}_i,\cdot)\right] - \mathbb{E}\left[m_\mu(y,\widetilde{K}_j,\cdot)\right]\right| \mathbb{1}_{\{\mathcal{R}_{\mu,t}\in\Gamma_i\}}\mathbb{1}_{\{\mathcal{R}_{\mu,s}\in\Gamma_j\}} \le \frac{L_\mu}{l_\mu}(s-t) + 2L_\mu\delta.$$

Combining this with (4.18) and sending $\delta\to 0$ yields

$$\left|\mathbb{E}\left[m_\mu(y,\mathcal{R}_{\mu,s},\cdot)\,|\,\mathcal{F}_{\mu,s}\right] - \mathbb{E}\left[m_\mu(y,\mathcal{R}_{\mu,t},\cdot)\,|\,\mathcal{F}_{\mu,t}\right]\right| \le L_\mu D + \frac{L_\mu}{l_\mu}(s-t). \tag{4.19}$$

Finally, from (4.12), we get

$$|X_t - X_s| \le L_\mu D + \left(\frac{L_\mu}{l_\mu} + 1\right)(s-t). \tag{4.20}$$

Define a discrete martingale sequence $\widetilde{X}_k := X_{hk}$ with $h := l_\mu L_\mu D/(l_\mu + L_\mu)$ and observe that, according to (4.20), for all $k\in\mathbb{N}$,

$$\left|\widetilde{X}_{k+1} - \widetilde{X}_k\right| \le 2L_\mu D.$$

An application of Azuma's inequality (Proposition 3.2) yields, for every $\lambda>0$ and $N\in\mathbb{N}$,

$$\mathbb{P}\left[\left|\widetilde{X}_N\right| > \lambda\right] \le \exp\left(\frac{-\lambda^2}{8L_\mu^2 D^2 N}\right). \tag{4.21}$$

Let N be the smallest integer larger than T/h so that $\widetilde{X}_N = X_T = m_\mu(y,0,\cdot) - M_\mu(y)$. It follows that, since $|y|>D$ and $T = L_\mu|y|$,

$$N \le \frac{T}{h} + 1 \le \frac{L_\mu(l_\mu+L_\mu)|y|}{l_\mu L_\mu D} + 1 \le \frac{(2l_\mu + L_\mu)|y|}{l_\mu D}. \tag{4.22}$$

From (4.8), (4.21) and (4.22) we deduce

$$\mathbb{P}\Big[\left|m_\mu(y,0,\cdot) - M_\mu(y)\right| > \lambda\Big] = \mathbb{P}\left[\left|\widetilde{X}_N\right| > \lambda\right] \le \exp\left(\frac{-\lambda^2 l_\mu}{8L_\mu^2(2l_\mu + L_\mu)D|y|}\right). \qquad \square$$

Remark 4.2. Integrating (4.4) yields

$$\operatorname{var}\left(m_\mu(y,0,\cdot)\right) = \int_0^\infty \mathbb{P}\Big[|m_\mu(y,0,\cdot) - M_\mu(y)| > \lambda^{\frac12} \Big] d\lambda \le \int_0^\infty \exp\left(-\frac{\mu\lambda}{C_1|y|} \right) d\lambda = \frac{C_1}{\mu}|y|,$$

which mirrors the bound on the variance of the time constant obtained by Kesten [18] for first passage percolation. Obtaining an optimal estimate for the fluctuations of the latter is a well-known open problem. It is conjectured that the variance of the time constant should behave, in dimension $d = 2$, like $O\big(|y|^{\frac23}\big)$ for large $|y|$, and it is believed that the oscillations should decrease in higher dimensions. Nevertheless, it is still open in every dimension $d \ge 2$ whether, for some $\alpha < 1$, this quantity is bounded by $O\left(|y|^\alpha\right)$ as $|y| \to \infty$. We expect that it will be similarly challenging to prove such a bound for our quantity $\operatorname{var}(m_\mu(y,0,\cdot))$, and still more difficult to find the optimal exponent for the algebraic rate of homogenization of (1.1).

In analogy with the best known variance bound in first-passage percolation, due to Benjamini, Kalai and Schramm [7], we expect that an estimate of the form

$$\operatorname{var}\left(m_\mu(y,0,\cdot)\right) \le \frac{C}{\mu}\left(\frac{|y|}{\log|y|} \right) \tag{4.23}$$

can be proved, in dimensions $d \ge 2$, by an application of Talagrand's concentration inequality [35]. In fact, as we were completing the writing of this paper, we received a new preprint by Matic and Nolen [26] who have obtained, in a slightly different setting, a bound like (4.23) for a certain class of Hamilton-Jacobi equations in special i.i.d. environments.

4.2. **The strategy for estimating $M_\mu(y) - \overline{m}_\mu(y)$.** Having estimated the oscillations of $m_\mu(y,0,\cdot)$ about its mean $M_\mu(y)$ in Proposition 4.1, in order to prove Theorem 1 it remains to estimate the rate at which the means $t^{-1}M_\mu(ty)$ converge, as $t \to \infty$, to their limit $\overline{m}_\mu(y)$. On one side our task is trivial. Indeed, owing to (A.4) and (A.8), we have

$$M_\mu(y+z) = \mathbb{E}\left[m_\mu(y+z,0,\cdot)\right] \le \mathbb{E}\left[m_\mu(y,0,\cdot)\right] + \mathbb{E}\left[m_\mu(y+z,y,\cdot)\right] = M_\mu(y) + M_\mu(z). \tag{4.24}$$

It follows from Fekete's lemma (Lemma 3.3 in the special case that $\Delta \equiv 0$) and (A.36) that, for every $y \in \mathbb{R}^d$,

$$M_\mu(y) \ge \inf_{t \ge 1} t^{-1} M_\mu(ty) = \lim_{t\to\infty} t^{-1} M_\mu(ty) = \overline{m}_\mu(y). \tag{4.25}$$

The estimate (2.12) is then immediate:

Proof of (2.12)**.** The inequality follows from (4.25) and (4.4). □

In order to prove (2.14) we are confronted with the more difficult task of finding good upper bounds for $M_\mu(y) - \overline{m}_\mu(y)$, which is the focus of the rest of this section. A typical argument for such an estimate (see the discussion in Hammersley [16]) and the strategy we use here involves approximating $M_\mu(y)$ by another quantity which is *superadditive*. Fekete's lemma (or, more precisely, Lemma 3.3) is then applied "from the other side" to obtain an estimate on the deviation of this approximate quantity from its asymptotic limit. The desired estimate in terms of the original quantity then follows, depending on the quality of the approximation. This strategy was used by Alexander [1] in the context of first-passage percolation to obtain estimates on the deviation of the expected passage time from the limiting time constant.

In our context, it turns out to be more convenient to first obtain estimates for the difference between the quantities

$$\mathbb{E}\left[m_\mu(H_t,0,\cdot)\right] := \mathbb{E}\left[\min_{z\in H_t} m_\mu(z,0,\cdot) \right] \qquad \text{and} \qquad \overline{m}_\mu(H_t) := \min_{z\in H_t} \overline{m}_\mu(z),$$

where H_t is a given plane a distance t from the origin. We then argue that the value of $\mathbb{E}\left[m_\mu(H_t,0,\cdot)\right]$ must be close to

$$M_\mu(H_t) := \min_{z\in H_t} M_\mu(z),$$

which yields good estimates for the deviation of the latter quantity from $\overline{m}_\mu(H_t)$. This is then transformed, using a simple geometric argument, into an estimate for $M_\mu(y)-\overline{m}_\mu(y)$ for large $|y|$.

4.3. **Introduction of the approximating quantity.** Fix a unit direction $e\in\mathbb{R}^d$ which for notational convenience we take to be $e=e_d=(0,\ldots,0,1)$. For each $t>0$, define the plane

$$H_t := te+\{e\}^\perp = \left\{(x',t)\,:\,x'\in\mathbb{R}^{d-1}\right\} \tag{4.26}$$

and its discrete analogue

$$\widehat{H}_t := \left\{(n,t)\,:\,n\in\mathbb{Z}^{d-1}\right\}. \tag{4.27}$$

We also denote, for $t>0$, the halfspaces

$$H_t^+ = \left\{(x',x_d)\in\mathbb{R}^d\,:\,x_d\geq t\right\} \qquad\text{and}\qquad H_t^- = \left\{(x',x_d)\in\mathbb{R}^d\,:\,x_d\leq t\right\}. \tag{4.28}$$

Define, for each $\sigma,t>0$, the quantities

$$G_{\mu,\sigma}(t) := \sum_{y\in\widehat{H}_t}\mathbb{E}\left[\exp\left(-\sigma m_\mu(y,0,\cdot)\right)\right] \qquad\text{and}\qquad g_{\mu,\sigma}(t) := -\frac{1}{\sigma}\log G_{\mu,\sigma}(t). \tag{4.29}$$

We show that $g_{\mu,\sigma}(t)$ is a good approximation of $\mathbb{E}\left[m_\mu(H_t,0,\cdot)\right]$ for suitable choices of $\sigma>0$. We first need a technical lemma, also used many times below, which asserts that a substantial portion of the quantity $G_{\mu,\sigma}(t)$ is contributed by lattice points $(n,t)\in\widehat{H}_t$ with $|n|\leq O(t)$. This implies in particular that $G_{\mu,\sigma}$ and $g_{\mu,\sigma}$ are finite.

Lemma 4.3. *There exists $C_7>0$ such that, for every $t>0$, $0<\sigma\leq 1$ and $R\geq (L_\mu/l_\mu)t$,*

$$G_{\mu,\sigma}(t)\leq \frac{C_7}{\sigma^{d-1}}\sum_{y\in\widehat{H}_t\cap B_R}\mathbb{E}\left[\exp\left(-\sigma m_\mu(y,0,\cdot)\right)\right]. \tag{4.30}$$

Proof. According to (4.3), for every $\omega\in\Omega$ and $y\in\mathbb{R}^d$,

$$\exp\left(-L_\mu\sigma|y|\right)\leq\exp\left(-\sigma m_\mu(y,0,\omega)\right)\leq\exp\left(-l_\mu\sigma|y|\right). \tag{4.31}$$

Thus

$$\begin{aligned}\sum_{y\in\widehat{H}_t\setminus B_R}\exp\left(-\sigma m_\mu(y,0,\omega)\right) &\leq \sum_{y\in\widehat{H}_t\setminus B_R}\exp\left(-l_\mu\sigma|y|\right)\leq\sum_{y\in\mathbb{Z}^{d-1}\setminus B_R}\exp\left(-l_\mu\sigma|y|\right)\\ &\leq C\int_R^\infty r^{d-2}\exp\left(-l_\mu\sigma r\right)\,dr = C\sigma^{1-d}\int_{\sigma R}^\infty\exp\left(-l_\mu r\right)\,dr,\end{aligned} \tag{4.32}$$

where $C>0$ depends only on d. Moreover,

$$\exp\left(-\sigma m_\mu(te,0,\omega)\right)\geq\exp\left(-L_\mu\sigma t\right)=\int_{L_\mu\sigma t/l_\mu}^\infty\exp\left(-l_\mu r\right)\,dr. \tag{4.33}$$

Since $R\geq(L_\mu/l_\mu)t$, it follows from (4.32) and (4.33) that, for every $\omega\in\Omega$,

$$\sum_{y\in\widehat{H}_t\setminus B_R}\exp\left(-\sigma m_\mu(y,0,\omega)\right)\leq C\sigma^{1-d}\exp\left(-\sigma m_\mu(te,0,\omega)\right)\leq C\sigma^{1-d}\sum_{y\in\widehat{H}_t\cap B_R}\exp\left(-\sigma m_\mu(y,0,\omega)\right).$$

Taking expectations yields

$$\begin{aligned} G_{\mu,\sigma}(t) &= \sum_{y\in \widehat{H}_t\cap B_R} \mathbb{E}\left[\exp\left(-\sigma m_\mu(y,0,\cdot)\right)\right] + \sum_{y\in \widehat{H}_t\setminus B_R} \mathbb{E}\left[\exp\left(-\sigma m_\mu(y,0,\cdot)\right)\right] \\ &\leq \left(1+C\sigma^{1-d}\right) \sum_{y\in \widehat{H}_t\cap B_R} \mathbb{E}\left[\exp\left(-\sigma m_\mu(y,0,\cdot)\right)\right]. \end{aligned}$$

We obtain (4.30) for $C_7 := (1+C)$, since $\sigma \leq 1$ implies $1+C\sigma^{1-d} \leq (1+C)\sigma^{1-d}$. □

Next we show that $g_{\mu,\sigma}(t)$ gives a good upper bound for $\mathbb{E}\left[m_\mu(H_t,0,\cdot)\right]$ for large t and appropriate choices of $\sigma > 0$.

Lemma 4.4. *There exists a constant $C_8 > 0$ such that, for every $t > D$ and $0 < \sigma \leq 1$,*

$$\mathbb{E}\left[m_\mu(H_t,0,\cdot)\right] - C_8\left(\frac{\sigma t}{\mu^2} + \frac{1}{\sigma}\log\left(1+\frac{t}{\sigma\mu}\right)\right) \leq g_{\mu,\sigma}(t) \leq \mathbb{E}\left[m_\mu(H_t,0,\cdot)\right] + C_8. \tag{4.34}$$

Proof. The upper bound in (4.34) is easy. Using (A.11), we have

$$\begin{aligned} G_{\mu,\sigma}(t) &\geq \mathbb{E}\left[\sup_{y\in\widehat{H}_t} \exp\left(-\sigma m_\mu(y,0,\cdot)\right)\right] = \mathbb{E}\left[\exp\left(-\sigma \inf_{y\in\widehat{H}_t} m_\mu(y,0,\cdot)\right)\right] \\ &\geq \mathbb{E}\left[\exp\left(-\sigma\left(m_\mu(H_t,0,\cdot)+L_\mu(d-1)^{\frac12}\right)\right)\right] = \exp\left(-\sigma L_\mu (d-1)^{\frac12}\right)\mathbb{E}\left[\exp\left(-\sigma m_\mu(H_t,0,\cdot)\right)\right]. \end{aligned}$$

After taking the logarithm of both sides of this inequality, an application of Jensen's inequality and a rearrangement yield the second inequality of (4.34) with $C_8 = (d-1)^{\frac12}L_\mu$.

To obtain the lower bound, we use both (4.4) and (4.30). For every $|y| > D$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}\left[\exp\left(-\sigma m_\mu(y,0,\cdot)\right]\right. &= \int_0^\infty \sigma\exp(-\sigma s)\mathbb{P}\left[m_\mu(y,0,\cdot)\leq s\right]\,ds \\ &\leq \sigma\exp\left(-\sigma M_\mu(y)\right) + \int_0^{M_\mu(y)} \sigma\exp(-\sigma s)\mathbb{P}\left[m_\mu(y,0,\cdot)\leq s\right]\,ds \\ &= \left(1+\int_0^{M_\mu(y)} \exp(\sigma\lambda)\mathbb{P}\left[m_\mu(y,0,\cdot)-M_\mu(y)\leq -\lambda\right]\,d\lambda\right)\sigma\exp\left(-\sigma M_\mu(y)\right). \end{aligned}$$

Applying (4.4), we obtain

$$\mathbb{E}\left[\exp\left(-\sigma m_\mu(y,0,\cdot)\right]\right. \leq \left(1+\int_0^{M_\mu(y)} \exp\left(\sigma\lambda - \frac{\mu\lambda^2}{C_1|y|}\right)\,d\lambda\right)\sigma\exp\left(-\sigma M_\mu(y)\right).$$

We estimate the integrand above by completing the square, i.e.,

$$\sigma\lambda - \frac{\mu\lambda^2}{C_1|y|} = -\frac{\mu}{C_1|y|}\left(\lambda - \frac{\sigma C_1|y|}{2\mu}\right)^2 + \frac{1}{4\mu}\sigma^2 C_1|y| \leq \frac{1}{4\mu}\sigma^2C_1|y|,$$

and thus obtain

$$\mathbb{E}\left[\exp\left(-\sigma m_\mu(y,0,\cdot)\right]\right. \leq \left(1+M_\mu(y)\exp\left(\frac{1}{4\mu}\sigma^2C_1|y|\right)\right)\sigma\exp\left(-\sigma M_\mu(y)\right). \tag{4.35}$$

Summing (4.35) over $y \in \widehat{H}_t \cap B_R$, with $R := (L_\mu / l_\mu)t$, and applying (4.30), we get

$$\begin{aligned} G_{\mu,\sigma}(t) &\leq C_7 \sigma^{2-d} \sum_{y \in \widehat{H}_t \cap B_R} \left(1 + M_\mu(y) \exp\left(\frac{1}{4\mu} \sigma^2 C_1 |y| \right) \right) \exp\left(-\sigma M_\mu(y)\right) \\ &\leq C_7 \sigma^{2-d} \sum_{y \in \widehat{H}_t \cap B_R} \left(1 + M_\mu(y) \exp\left(\frac{1}{4\mu} \sigma^2 C_1 |y| \right) \right) \exp\left(-\sigma \mathbb{E}\left[m_\mu(H_t, 0, \cdot)\right]\right) \\ &\leq C_7 \sigma^{2-d} R^{d-1} \exp\left(-\sigma \mathbb{E}\left[m_\mu(H_t, 0, \cdot)\right]\right) \left(1 + L_\mu t \exp\left(\frac{1}{4\mu} \sigma^2 C_1 R \right) \right) \end{aligned}$$

Since, in view of (4.2), $R \leq Ct/\mu$, we obtain

$$G_{\mu,\sigma}(t) \leq C t^d \sigma^{2-d} \mu^{1-d} \exp\left(-\sigma \mathbb{E}\left[m_\mu(H_t, 0, \cdot)\right] + \frac{C\sigma^2 t}{\mu^2} \right).$$

Taking logarithms, dividing by $-\sigma$ and rearranging the expression yields the desired result. ☐

4.4. **The (almost) superadditivity of $g_{\mu,\sigma}$ and estimates for $\mathbb{E}\left[m_\mu(H_t, 0, \omega)\right] - \overline{m}_\mu(H_t)$.** The next step is to prove that $g_{\mu,\sigma}$ is essentially superadditive, which is summarized in the following lemma. Unlike the approach taken in [1], we do not use an abstract result like the van den Berg-Kesten inequality, which does not seem to easily apply in the continuous setting. We opt instead for a simpler "splitting technique" to apply the independence assumption more directly. A similar technique was employed by Sznitman [33].

The critical property of the m_μ's needed here, which allows us to exploit the independence of the random medium, is the *dynamic programming principle.* It asserts that, if every path from x to y passes through a surface, then, for some z on the surface, the cost of moving from x to y is equal to the sum of the cost of moving from x to z and from z to y. Precisely, for every open $U \subseteq \mathbb{R}^d$ with $x \in U$ and every $y \in \mathbb{R}^d \setminus U$ and $\omega \in \Omega$,

$$m_\mu(y, x, \omega) = \min_{z \in \partial U} \big(m_\mu(y, z, \omega) + m_\mu(z, x, \omega) \big). \tag{4.36}$$

This is proved in Appendix A, see Proposition A.2(vi).

Lemma 4.5. *There is a constant $C_9 > 0$ such that, for every $s, t > D$ and $0 < \sigma \leq 1$,*

$$g_{\mu,\sigma}(t+s) \geq g_{\mu,\sigma}(t) + g_{\mu,\sigma}(s) - \frac{C_9}{\sigma} \left(1 + \log\left(1 + \frac{s+t}{\sigma\mu} \right) \right). \tag{4.37}$$

Proof. Fix $s, t > 0$, $y \in H_{s+t}$, $\omega \in \Omega$ and observe that, in view of (4.36),

$$m_\mu(y, 0, \omega) = \min_{z \in H_t} \left(m_\mu(z, 0, \omega) + m_\mu(y, z, \omega) \right) \geq m_\mu(H_t, 0, \omega) + m_\mu(y, H_t, \omega).$$

Thus, using (A.11),

$$m_\mu(y, 0, \omega) \geq m_\mu(H_t, 0, \omega) + m_\mu(y, H_{t+D}, \omega) - L_\mu D.$$

Since $0 \in H_t^-$ and $y \in H_t^+$, we have

$$m_\mu(H_t, 0, \omega) = m_\mu(H_t^+, 0, \omega) \quad \text{and} \quad m_\mu(y, H_{t+D}, \omega) = m_\mu(y, H_{t+D}^-, \omega),$$

which is immediate from the expression (A.30) and (4.3). Applying (A.34), we conclude that

$$m_\mu(H_t^+, 0, \cdot) \ \text{ is } \ \mathcal{G}(H_t^-)\text{-measurable} \quad \text{and} \quad m_\mu(y, H_{t+D}^-, \cdot) \ \text{ is } \ \mathcal{G}(H_{t+D}^+)\text{-measurable}. \tag{4.38}$$

In light of (2.3), these random variables are independent and thus

$$\mathbb{E}\left[\exp\left(-\sigma m_\mu(y,0,\cdot)\right)\right] \le \exp\left(\sigma L_\mu D\right) \mathbb{E}\left[\exp\left(-\sigma m_\mu(H_t^+,0,\cdot)\right)\right] \mathbb{E}\left[\exp\left(-\sigma m_\mu(y,H_{t+D}^-,\cdot)\right)\right].$$

Returning to the discrete setting, we next claim that, for $R := L_\mu(s+t)/l_\mu$,

$$m_\mu(H_t^+,0,\omega) = m_\mu(H_t,0,\omega) \ge \min_{z\in\widehat{H}_t\cap B_R} m_\mu(z,0,\omega) - L_\mu(d-1)^{\frac{1}{2}}. \tag{4.39}$$

Indeed, it is clear from (4.3) that any $z\in\widehat{H}_t$ attaining the minimum on the left side of (4.39) must belong to B_R, and (4.39) then follows from (A.11). In a similar way, since $|y|\le R$,

$$m_\mu(y,H_{t+D}^-,\omega) \ge \min_{z\in\widehat{H}_t\cap B_{2R}} m_\mu(y,z,\omega) - L_\mu\left(D+(d-1)^{\frac{1}{2}}\right).$$

Combining these inequalities, we obtain

$$\mathbb{E}\left[\exp\left(-\sigma m_\mu(y,0,\cdot)\right)\right] \le \exp\left(C\sigma\right) \sum_{z,z'\in\widehat{H}_t\cap B_{2R}} \mathbb{E}\left[\exp\left(-\sigma m_\mu(z,0,\cdot)\right)\right] \mathbb{E}\left[\exp\left(-\sigma m_\mu(y,z',\cdot)\right)\right].$$

Note that, if $z'\in\widehat{H}_t$, then $y-z'\in\widehat{H}_s$. So, in view of the definition of $G_{\mu,\sigma}$ and (A.4), we have

$$\sum_{z'\in\widehat{H}_t} \mathbb{E}\left[\exp\left(-\sigma m_\mu(y,z',\cdot)\right)\right] = \sum_{z'\in\widehat{H}_t} \mathbb{E}\left[\exp\left(-\sigma m_\mu(y-z',0,\cdot)\right)\right] = G_{\mu,\sigma}(s).$$

Therefore

$$\mathbb{E}\left[\exp\left(-\sigma m_\mu(y,0,\cdot)\right)\right] \le \exp\left(C\sigma\right) G_{\mu,\sigma}(t) G_{\mu,\sigma}(s).$$

Summing over all $y\in\widehat{H}_{t+s}\cap B_R$ and using Lemma 4.3 yields

$$G_{\mu,\sigma}(s+t) \le CR^{d-1}\sigma^{1-d}\exp\left(C\sigma\right) G_{\mu,\sigma}(t)G_{\mu,\sigma}(s).$$

Taking logarithms and dividing by σ concludes the proof. □

We next use Lemma 3.3 to obtain a rate of convergence for the means $t^{-1}\mathbb{E}\left[m_\mu(H_t,0,\cdot)\right]$ to their limit $\overline{m}_\mu(H_t)$.

Lemma 4.6. *There exists a constant $C_{10}>0$ such that, for every $t>D$,*

$$\mathbb{E}\left[m_\mu(H_t,0,\cdot)\right] \le \overline{m}_\mu(H_t) + C_{10}\left(\frac{t}{\mu^2}\log\left(1+\frac{t}{\mu}\right)\right)^{\frac{1}{2}}. \tag{4.40}$$

Proof. According to Lemma 4.5, the quantity $g_{\sigma,\mu}$ is almost superadditive. More precisely, for all $s,t>0$, we have

$$g_{\sigma,\mu}(s+t) \ge g_{\sigma,\mu}(s) + g_{\sigma,\mu}(t) - \Delta_{\sigma,\mu}(s+t), \tag{4.41}$$

where, for C_9 as in (4.37),

$$\Delta_{\sigma,\mu}(t) := \frac{C_9}{\sigma}\left(1+\log\left(1+\frac{t}{\sigma\mu}\right)\right).$$

Since $\Delta_{\sigma,\mu}$ is increasing on $[1,\infty)$ and

$$\int_1^\infty \frac{\Delta_{\sigma,\mu}(t)}{t^2}\,dt < \infty,$$

we may apply Lemma 3.3 to deduce that $\overline{g}_{\sigma,\mu} := \lim_{t\to\infty} g_{\sigma,\mu}(t)/t$ exists and, for every $t>1$,

$$\frac{1}{t}g_{\sigma,\mu}(t) - 4\int_{2t}^\infty \frac{\Delta_{\sigma,\mu}(s)}{s^2}\,ds \le \overline{g}_{\sigma,\mu}.$$

An easy integration by parts yields

$$4\int_{2t}^{\infty} \frac{\Delta_{\sigma,\mu}(s)}{s^2}\,ds \leq \frac{C}{\sigma t}\left(1+\log\left(1+\frac{t}{\sigma\mu}\right)\right).$$

In view of the second inequality in (4.34), we also have

$$\overline{g}_{\sigma,\mu} \leq \lim_{t\to+\infty} \frac{1}{t}\left(\mathbb{E}\left[m_\mu(H_t,0,\cdot)\right]+CL_\mu\right) = \overline{m}_\mu(H_1).$$

Combining the previous three estimates, we obtain

$$\frac{1}{t} g_{\sigma,\mu}(t) \leq \overline{m}_\mu(H_1) + \frac{C}{\sigma t}\left(1+\log\left(1+\frac{t}{\sigma\mu}\right)\right).$$

Multiplying by t, applying the first inequality in (4.34) and using the positive homogeneity of $\overline{m}_\mu$ yields

$$\mathbb{E}\left[m_\mu(H_t,0,\cdot)\right] \leq \overline{m}_\mu(H_t) + C\left(\frac{\sigma t}{\mu^2}+\frac{1}{\sigma}+\frac{1}{\sigma}\log\left(1+\frac{t}{\sigma\mu}\right)\right),$$

and choosing $\sigma := \mu t^{-\frac{1}{2}}(\log(1+t/\mu))^{\frac{1}{2}}$ completes the proof. ☐

4.5. **Error estimates for** $M_\mu(y)-\overline{m}_\mu(y)$ **and the proof of** (2.14)**.** It is the rate of convergence of $t^{-1}M_\mu(ty)$ to $\overline{m}_\mu(y)$ that we wish to estimate, not that of $t^{-1}\mathbb{E}\left[m_\mu(H_t,0,\cdot)\right]$ to $\overline{m}_\mu(H_1)$. In order to reach our desired goal, we must compare the quantities $M_\mu(y)$ and $\mathbb{E}\left[m_\mu(H_t,0,\cdot)\right]$. This is accomplished in two steps. The first is to show that the quantities $\mathbb{E}\left[m_\mu(H_t,0,\cdot)\right]$ and

$$M_\mu(H_t) := \min_{y\in H_t} M_\mu(y)$$

are close, which then gives an estimate for the difference between $M_\mu(H_t)$ and $\overline{m}_\mu(H_t)$. The second step is to use elementary convex geometry to relate $M_\mu(y)$ to the values of $M_\mu(H)$ for all the possible planes H passing through y.

Lemma 4.7. *There is a constant* $C_{11}>0$ *such that, for each* $t>D$*,*

$$M_\mu(H_t) \leq \mathbb{E}\left[m_\mu(H_t,0,\cdot)\right] + C_{11}\left(\frac{t}{\mu}\log\left(1+\frac{t}{\mu}\right)\right)^{\frac{1}{2}}. \tag{4.42}$$

Proof. Let $R:=(L_\mu/l_\mu)t$. For every $\omega\in\Omega$, there exists $z\in H_t\cap B_R$ such that $m_\mu(z,0,\omega) = m_\mu(H_t,0,\omega)$. Hence there exists $\widehat{z}\in\widehat{H}_t\cap B_R$ such that

$$m_\mu(\widehat{z},0,\omega) \leq m_\mu(H_t,0,\omega) + L_\mu(d-1)^{\frac{1}{2}}.$$

For every $z\in H_t$ we have $\mathbb{E}\left[m_\mu(z,0,\cdot)\right] = M_\mu(z) \geq M_\mu(H_t)$ and thus, for every $\lambda>0$,

$$\begin{aligned}&\left\{\omega\in\Omega \,:\, M_\mu(H_t)-m_\mu(H_t,0,\omega) \geq \lambda + L_\mu(d-1)^{\frac{1}{2}}\right\}\\ &\qquad\qquad \subseteq \bigcup_{z\in\widehat{H}_t\cap B_R} \left\{\omega\in\Omega \,:\, m_\mu(z,0,\omega)\leq M_\mu(z)-\lambda\right\}.\end{aligned} \tag{4.43}$$

Applying (4.4), we find

$$\begin{aligned}\mathbb{P}\left[M_\mu(H_t)-m_\mu(H_t,0,\cdot) \geq \lambda + L_\mu(d-1)^{\frac{1}{2}}\right] &\leq CR^{d-1}\max_{z\in H_t}\mathbb{P}\left[m_\mu(z,0,\cdot)-M_\mu(z)\leq-\lambda\right]\\ &\leq CR^{d-1}\exp\left(-\frac{\mu\lambda^2}{C_1R}\right) \leq C\mu^{1-d}t^{d-1}\exp\left(-\frac{\mu\lambda^2}{Ct}\right).\end{aligned} \tag{4.44}$$

We wish to use the expression

$$M_\mu(H_t) - \mathbb{E}\left[m_\mu(H_t,0,\cdot)\right] \le \int_0^\infty \mathbb{P}\left[M_\mu(H_t) - m_\mu(H_t,0,\cdot) \ge \lambda\right] d\lambda \tag{4.45}$$

and then apply (4.44) to the right side of (4.45), but due to the factor t^{d-1} on the right side of (4.44), this bound is not very helpful unless λ is large relative to t. With this in mind we fix $A > 0$, to be selected below, define

$$\lambda_1 := 1 + \left(\frac{At}{\mu}\log\left(1+\frac{t}{\mu}\right)\right)^{\frac{1}{2}}$$

and then estimate the right side of (4.45) by

$$\begin{aligned}
&\int_0^\infty \mathbb{P}\left[M_\mu(H_t) - m_\mu(H_t,0,\cdot) \ge \lambda\right] d\lambda \\
&\qquad \le \lambda_1 + L_\mu(d-1)^{\frac{1}{2}} + \int_{\lambda_1}^\infty \mathbb{P}\left[M_\mu(H_t) - m_\mu(H_t,0,\cdot) \ge \lambda + L_\mu(d-1)^{\frac{1}{2}}\right] d\lambda \\
&\qquad \le \lambda_1 + L_\mu(d-1)^{\frac{1}{2}} + C\mu^{1-d}t^{d-1}\int_{\lambda_1}^\infty \exp\left(-\frac{\mu\lambda^2}{Ct}\right) d\lambda.
\end{aligned}$$

Observe that

$$\begin{aligned}
\mu^{1-d}t^{d-1}\int_{\lambda_1}^\infty \exp\left(-\frac{\mu\lambda^2}{Ct}\right) d\lambda &\le \mu^{1-d}t^{d-1}\int_{\lambda_1}^\infty \exp\left(-\frac{\mu\lambda_1\lambda}{Ct}\right) d\lambda \\
&= C\mu^{1-d}t^{d-1}\frac{t}{\mu\lambda_1}\exp\left(-\frac{\mu\lambda_1^2}{Ct}\right) \le C\left(\frac{t}{\mu}\right)^d\left(1+\frac{t}{\mu}\right)^{-\frac{A}{C}}.
\end{aligned}$$

By selecting A to be a large enough constant, the last expression on the right is at most C. Combining the last two sets of inequalities with (4.45), we obtain

$$M_\mu(H_t) - \mathbb{E}\left[m_\mu(H_t,0,\cdot)\right] \le \lambda_1 + L_\mu(d-1)^{\frac{1}{2}} + C \le \lambda_1 + C, \tag{4.46}$$

which implies (4.42). □

Lemmas 4.6 and 4.7 give an estimate on the difference of $M_\mu(H_t)$ and $\overline{m}_\mu(H_t)$.

Corollary 4.8. *There exists $C_{12} > 0$ such that, for every $t > D$,*

$$M_\mu(H_t) \le \overline{m}_\mu(H_t) + C_{12}\left(\frac{t}{\mu^2}\log\left(1+\frac{t}{\mu}\right)\right)^{\frac{1}{2}}. \tag{4.47}$$

The relationship between $M_\mu(H_t)$ and $M_\mu(y)$ depends on the following geometric lemma.

Lemma 4.9. *There exists $C_{13} > 0$ such that, for every $N \in \mathbb{N}$ and $\alpha > 0$,*

$$\operatorname{conv}\left\{y \in \mathbb{R}^d \,:\, M_\mu(y) \le \alpha\right\} \subseteq \left\{y \in \mathbb{R}^d \,:\, M_\mu(Ny) \le (N + C_{13}/\mu)\alpha\right\}. \tag{4.48}$$

Proof. Let $\alpha > 0$, $N \in \mathbb{N}^*$ and select $y \in \operatorname{conv}\{y \in \mathbb{R}^d : M_\mu(y) \le \alpha\}$. According to Carathéodory's theorem (see for example [14]), there exist $y_1, \ldots, y_{d+1}$ and $\lambda_1, \ldots, \lambda_{d+1} \in [0,1]$ such that

$$y = \sum_{j=1}^{d+1}\lambda_j y_j, \qquad 1 = \sum_{j=1}^{d+1}\lambda_j \qquad \text{and} \qquad M_\mu(y_j) \le \alpha \ \text{ for every } \ 1 \le j \le d+1.$$

For each $1 \leq j \leq d+1$, select $\sigma_j \in \mathbb{Q}$ such that $\sigma_j N \in \mathbb{N}$ and $0 \leq \lambda_j - \sigma_j \leq 1/N$, define $z := \sum_{j=1}^{d+1} \sigma_j y_j$ and observe that, by (4.3),

$$|y-z| \leq \frac{d+1}{N} \max_{1 \leq j \leq N} |y_j| \leq \frac{(d+1)\alpha}{N l_\mu}$$

and, by (4.2) and (4.3),

$$M_\mu(Ny) \leq M_\mu(Nz) + L_\mu N|z-y| \leq M_\mu(Nz) + \left(\frac{(d+1)L_\mu}{l_\mu}\right)\alpha \leq M_\mu(Nz) + \frac{C\alpha}{\mu}. \tag{4.49}$$

Notice that, since $N\sigma_j \in \mathbb{N}$ and $Nz = \sum_{j=1}^{d+1}(N\sigma_j)y_j$, we may apply (4.24) to deduce that

$$M_\mu(Nz) \leq \sum_{j=1}^{d+1}(N\sigma_j)M_\mu(y_j) \leq N\alpha \sum_{j=1}^{d+1}\sigma_j \leq N\alpha \sum_{j=1}^{d+1}\lambda_j = N\alpha. \tag{4.50}$$

Combining (4.49) and (4.50) yields the lemma. □

The previous lemma and (4.47) yield a rate of convergence for $M_\mu(y)$ to $\overline{m}_\mu(y)$.

Lemma 4.10. *There exists a constant $C_{14} > 0$ such that, for every $|y| > D$,*

$$M_\mu(y) \leq \overline{m}_\mu(y) + C_{14}\left(\frac{|y|^{\frac{1}{2}}}{\mu^{\frac{3}{2}}} + \frac{|y|^{\frac{2}{3}}}{\mu}\right)\left(\log\left(1+\frac{|y|}{\mu}\right)\right)^{\frac{1}{2}}. \tag{4.51}$$

Proof. The first step is to show that, for every $z \in \mathbb{R}^d$ such that $|z| > D$,

$$z \in \operatorname{conv}\left\{ y \in \mathbb{R}^d \,:\, M_\mu(y) \leq \overline{m}_\mu(z) + C_{12}\left(\frac{|z|}{\mu^2}\log\left(1+\frac{|z|}{\mu}\right)\right)^{\frac{1}{2}}\right\}, \tag{4.52}$$

where $C_{12} > 0$ is as in (4.47). Suppose on the contrary that (4.52) fails for some $z \in \mathbb{R}^d$ with $t := |z| > D$. By elementary convex separation, there exists a plane H with $z \in H$ such that

$$M_\mu(H) > \overline{m}_\mu(z) + A \quad \text{where} \quad A := C_{12}\left(\frac{t}{\mu^2}\log\left(1+\frac{t}{\mu}\right)\right)^{\frac{1}{2}}.$$

Since H is at most a distance of $|z| = t$ from the origin, we may assume with no loss of generality that $H = H_s$ for some $s \leq t$. We deduce that

$$M_\mu(H_s) > \overline{m}_\mu(z) + A \geq \overline{m}_\mu(H_s) + C_{12}\left(\frac{s}{\mu^2}\log\left(1+\frac{s}{\mu}\right)\right)^{\frac{1}{2}},$$

a contradiction to (4.47). Thus (4.52) holds.

Now we fix $y \in \mathbb{R}^d$ with $|y| > D$ and apply (4.52) to $z := y/N$, with $N \in \mathbb{N}^*$ to be chosen below, to conclude that

$$y/N \in \operatorname{conv}\left\{ x \in \mathbb{R}^d \,:\, M_\mu(x) \leq \overline{m}_\mu(y/N) + C_{12}\left(\frac{|y|}{N\mu^2}\log\left(1+\frac{|y|}{N\mu}\right)\right)^{\frac{1}{2}}\right\}$$

and, after an application of (4.48),

$$\begin{aligned}M_\mu(y) &\le \left(N+\frac{C_{13}}{\mu}\right)\left(\overline{m}_\mu(y/N)+C_{12}\left(\frac{|y|}{N\mu^2}\log\left(1+\frac{|y|}{N\mu}\right)\right)^{\frac12}\right)\\ &\le \overline{m}_\mu(y)+C_{13}L_\mu\frac{|y|}{N\mu}+C_{12}\left(\frac{N|y|}{\mu^2}\log\left(1+\frac{|y|}{N\mu}\right)\right)^{\frac12}+C_{12}C_{13}\left(\frac{|y|}{N\mu^4}\log\left(1+\frac{|y|}{N\mu}\right)\right)^{\frac12}.\end{aligned}$$

In the case that $|y|^{-1}\le\mu^3$, then we let N be the smallest integer larger than $|y|^{\frac13}$ to get, after using that $|y|>D$ and $\mu\le K$,

$$M_\mu(y)\le\overline{m}_\mu(y)+C\frac{|y|^{\frac23}}{\mu}\left(\log\left(1+\frac{|y|}{\mu}\right)\right)^{\frac12}. \tag{4.53}$$

If, on the other hand, $0<\mu^3<|y|^{-1}$, then we let N be the smallest integer larger than μ^{-1} to get

$$M_\mu(y)\le\overline{m}_\mu(y)+C\frac{|y|^{\frac12}}{\mu^{\frac32}}\left(\log\left(1+|y|\right)\right)^{\frac12}. \tag{4.54}$$

In either case we get (4.51). □

The previous lemma provides the desired estimate for the difference between $t^{-1}M_\mu(ty)$ and $\overline{m}_\mu(y)$ for large $t>0$, and now the proof of Theorem 1 follows immediately.

Proof of (2.14)**.** The estimate is immediate from Proposition 4.1 and Lemma 4.10. □

4.6. **Some further error estimates.** We conclude this section with versions of (2.12) and (2.14) which hold uniformly for $y\in B_R$. These estimates, which are needed in the next section, follow from Theorem 1 and a simple covering argument.

Lemma 4.11. *There exists $C_{15}>0$ such that, for every $\lambda\ge 4L_\mu D$ and $R\ge 3D$,*

$$\mathbb{P}\left[\inf_{y\in B_R}\left(m_\mu(y,0,\cdot)-\overline{m}_\mu(y)\right)\le-\lambda\right]\le C_{15}R^d\exp\left(-\frac{\mu\lambda^2}{4C_1R}\right), \tag{4.55}$$

and, if

$$\lambda\ge 2C_2\left(\frac{R^{\frac12}}{\mu^{\frac32}}+\frac{R^{\frac23}}{\mu}\right)\left(\log\left(1+\frac{R}{\mu}\right)\right)^{\frac12}, \tag{4.56}$$

then

$$\mathbb{P}\left[\sup_{y\in B_R}\left(m_\mu(y,0,\cdot)-\overline{m}_\mu(y)\right)\ge\lambda\right]\le C_{15}R^d\exp\left(-\frac{\mu\lambda^2}{16C_1}\right). \tag{4.57}$$

Proof. We may select $y_1,\ldots,y_N\in B_R\setminus B_D$ with $N\le C(R/D)^d\le CR^d$ such that B_R is covered by the balls $B(y_j,2D)$. Then by (A.11) we have, for any $\lambda>0$,

$$\mathbb{P}\left[\inf_{y\in B_R}\left(m_\mu(y,0,\cdot)-\overline{m}_\mu(y)\right)\le-\frac{\lambda}{2}-2L_\mu D\right]\le\sum_{j=1}^N\mathbb{P}\left[m_\mu(y_j,0,\cdot)-\overline{m}_\mu(y_j)\le-\frac{\lambda}{2}\right].$$

According to (2.12), for each $1\le j\le N$,

$$\mathbb{P}\left[m_\mu(y_j,0,\cdot)-\overline{m}_\mu(y_j)\le-\frac{\lambda}{2}\right]\le\exp\left(-\frac{\mu\lambda^2}{4C_1|y_j|}\right)\le\exp\left(-\frac{\mu\lambda^2}{4C_1R}\right).$$

Since $N \leq CR^d$, we obtain, for every $\lambda \geq 4L_\mu D$,

$$\mathbb{P}\left[\inf_{y\in B_R}\left(m_\mu(y,0,\cdot)-\overline{m}_\mu(y)\right)\leq -\lambda\right]\leq CR^d\exp\left(-\frac{\mu\lambda^2}{4C_1R}\right).$$

The estimate (4.57) is obtained in a very similar way from Theorem 1 and a covering argument. We omit the proof. □

5. Error estimates for the approximate cell problem

Here we obtain estimates on the difference between $-\delta v^\delta(y,\omega\,;p)$ and $\overline{H}(p)$, study the rate for the almost sure convergence

$$\lim_{\delta\to 0}\sup_{y\in B_{R/\delta}}\left|\delta v^\delta(y,\omega\,;p)+\overline{H}(p)\right|=0 \tag{5.1}$$

and prove Theorems 2 and 3. The main difficulty comes from the fact that the rate for the approximate cell problem may be very different depending on whether p belongs to the flat spot $\{\overline{H}=0\}$ or not. Recall that the flat spot is never empty since, e.g., $\overline{H}(0)=0$ (see Appendix A). Moreover, unless for example H is positively homogeneous with respect to p, the flat spot $\{\overline{H}=0\}$ is in general equal to $\{0\}$ (see, e.g., [3]). We use the metric problem to control the $-\delta v^\delta$'s from above, and from below for p's away from the flat spot $\{\overline{H}=0\}$. To obtain the upper bound on the flat spot we study directly the behavior of the δv^δ's.

The definition and basic properties of the $v^\delta(y,\omega\,;p)$'s are given in Appendix B. We recall here two important estimates, namely

$$-\operatorname*{ess\,sup}_{\Omega} H(p,0,\cdot)\leq \delta v^\delta(y,\omega\,;p)\leq -\operatorname*{ess\,inf}_{\Omega} H(p,0,\cdot) \tag{5.2}$$

and

$$\left|v^\delta(y,\omega\,;p)-v^\delta(z,\omega\,;p)\right|\leq K_p|y-z|, \tag{5.3}$$

where $K_p>0$ is given explicitly in (B.6) and depends only on H and an upper bound for $|p|$.

Throughout this section the positive constants $C, C_1, C_2, \ldots$ and $c, c_1, c_2, \ldots$ depend only on an upper bound for $|p|$, the underlying dimension d and the assumptions for H. We allow the constants C and c to vary from line to line.

5.1. The ballistic regime.

We combine the exponential error estimates for the metric problem obtained in the previous section with a comparison argument to obtain estimates on the difference between $-\delta v^\delta(y,\omega\,;p)$ and $\overline{H}(p)$. The comparison argument, which was introduced in [4] to prove homogenization, yields an estimate from below for $\delta v^\delta+\overline{H}(p)$ for all $p\in\mathbb{R}^d$ and from above only for p's away from the flat spot.

Proof of Theorem 2(i). We begin with the demonstration of (2.15). Fix $0<\delta\leq\lambda\leq 1$ and $\omega\in\Omega$ such that $-\delta v^\delta(0,\omega\,;p)\geq\overline{H}(p)+\lambda$. By (2.5) and (5.3), for $0<c<1$ sufficiently small,

$$w(y):=v^\delta(y,\omega\,;p)-v^\delta(0,\omega\,;p)+c\lambda\left(1+|y|^2\right)^{\frac{1}{2}}-c\lambda$$

satisfies

$$H(p+Dw,y,\omega)\geq -\delta v^\delta(y,\omega\,;p)-\frac{1}{4}\lambda \quad \text{in } \mathbb{R}^d.$$

According to (5.2), there exists $y_1\in\mathbb{R}^d$ such that $|y_1|\leq C/\lambda\delta$ and

$$w(y_1)=\inf_{y\in\mathbb{R}^d}w(y)\leq w(0)=0. \tag{5.4}$$

Define $U := \left\{ y \in \mathbb{R}^d \, : \, w(y) < \lambda/4\delta \right\}$ and notice that, for every $y \in U$,

$$-\delta v^\delta(y,\omega\,;p) \geq -\delta v^\delta(0,\omega\,;p) - \frac{1}{4}\lambda \geq \overline{H}(p) + \frac{3}{4}\lambda.$$

In particular,

$$H(p+Dw,y,\omega) \geq \overline{H}(p) + \frac{1}{2}\lambda \quad \text{in } U.$$

Next we denote $\widehat{w}(y) := w(y) - w(y_1) + c\lambda \left(1+|y-y_1|^2\right)^{\frac{1}{2}} - c\lambda$ and observe that, by $|Dw| \leq K_p + 1$ and (2.5), if $c>0$ is small enough, then

$$H(p+D\widehat{w},y,\omega) \geq \overline{H}(p) + \frac{1}{3}\lambda \quad \text{in } U. \tag{5.5}$$

Also notice that $\widehat{w} \geq w$, $\widehat{w}(y_1) = 0$ and $\widehat{w}(y) \geq c\lambda\left(1+|y-y_1|^2\right)^{\frac{1}{2}} - c\lambda$. Therefore, if we define $V := \left\{ y \in \mathbb{R}^d \, : \, \widehat{w}(y) < \lambda/4\delta \right\}$, then, for some $0 < R \leq C/\delta$, we have

$$V \subseteq U \cap B(y_1,R). \tag{5.6}$$

Let $\mu := \overline{H}(p) + \lambda/4$ and $\widehat{m}(y) := -m_\mu(y_1,y,\omega) - p\cdot(y-y_1)$ and observe that, according to (A.14),

$$H(p+D\widehat{m},y,\omega) \leq \overline{H}(p) + \frac{1}{4}\lambda \quad \text{in } \mathbb{R}^d. \tag{5.7}$$

The comparison principle (Proposition 3.4) yields

$$\max_{y\in\partial V}\left(-m_\mu(y_1,y,\omega) + p\cdot(y_1-y)\right) = \max_{\partial V}\left(\widehat{m} - \widehat{w}\right) + \frac{\lambda}{4\delta} \geq \widehat{m}(y_1) - \widehat{w}(y_1) + \frac{\lambda}{4\delta} = \frac{\lambda}{4\delta}. \tag{5.8}$$

Since $\mu > \overline{H}(p)$ we see from (A.38) that $p \in \partial\overline{m}_\mu(0)$, that is, for every $z\in\mathbb{R}^d$,

$$\overline{m}_\mu(z) \geq p\cdot z. \tag{5.9}$$

Using (5.8), (5.9) and the fact that $\partial V \subseteq \overline{B}(y_1,R)$, we obtain

$$\inf_{y\in\overline{B}(y_1,R)} \left(m_\mu(y_1,y,\omega) - \overline{m}_\mu(y_1-y)\right) \leq -\frac{\lambda}{4\delta}.$$

In view of (A.11) and $|y_1| \leq C/\lambda\delta$, we deduce that, for some $c>0$ small enough, there exists

$$z \in K := \{c\lambda k/\delta \, : \, k\in\mathbb{Z}^d\} \cap B_{C/\lambda\delta},$$

such that

$$\inf_{y\in B(z,R)} \left(m_\mu(z,y,\omega) - \overline{m}_\mu(z-y)\right) \leq -\frac{\lambda}{8\delta}.$$

In summary, we have shown that, for some fixed $R \leq C/\delta$,

$$\left\{\omega\in\Omega \, : \, -\delta v^\delta(0,\omega\,;p) \geq \overline{H}(p) + \lambda\right\} \subseteq \bigcup_{z\in K}\left\{\omega\in\Omega \, : \, \inf_{y\in B(z,R)}\left(m_\mu(z,y,\omega) - \overline{m}_\mu(z-y)\right) \leq -\frac{\lambda}{8\delta}\right\}.$$

Hence, using (A.4), $\delta\leq\lambda$, that $|K| \leq C\lambda^{-2d}$, $\mu \geq \lambda/4$ and (4.55), we obtain

$$\begin{aligned}\mathbb{P}\left[-\delta v^\delta(0,\cdot\,;p) \geq \overline{H}(p)+\lambda\right] &\leq C\lambda^{-2d}\,\mathbb{P}\left[\inf_{y\in B_R}\left(m_\mu(y,0,\cdot) - \overline{m}_\mu(y)\right) \leq -\frac{\lambda}{8\delta}\right] \\ &\leq C\delta^{-2d}R^d\exp\left(-\frac{\mu\lambda^2}{C\delta^2 R}\right) \leq C\delta^{-3d}\exp\left(-\frac{\lambda^3}{C\delta}\right).\end{aligned}$$

This completes the proof of (2.15). □

Proof of Theorem 2(ii). The proof of (2.17) is similar to that of (2.15). Since it is a bit more complicated, we give complete details. Fix $\omega \in \Omega$ for which $-\delta v^\delta(0,\omega\,;p) \geq \overline{H}(p) + \lambda$. According to (2.5), (5.3) and Lemma 3.5, if $c > 0$ is chosen sufficiently small, then

$$w(y) := v^\delta(y,\omega\,;p) - v^\delta(0,\omega\,;p) - c\lambda|y|$$

satisfies

$$H(p + Dw, y, \omega) \leq -\delta v^\delta(y,\omega\,;p) + \frac{1}{4}\lambda \quad \text{in } \mathbb{R}^d.$$

Moreover, according to (5.2), there exists $y_2 \in \mathbb{R}^d$ such that $|y_2| \leq C/\lambda\delta$ and

$$w(y_2) = \sup_{y \in \mathbb{R}^d} w(y) \geq w(0) = 0. \tag{5.10}$$

Define $U := \left\{ y \in \mathbb{R}^d \,:\, w(y) > -\lambda/4\delta \right\}$ and observe that, for every $y \in U$,

$$-\delta v^\delta(y,\omega\,;p) \leq -\delta v^\delta(0,\omega\,;p) + \frac{1}{4}\lambda \leq \overline{H}(p) - \frac{3}{4}\lambda$$

and, therefore,

$$H(p + Dw, y, \omega) \leq \overline{H}(p) - \frac{1}{2}\lambda \quad \text{in } U.$$

By $|Dw| \leq C$ and (2.5), there exists $c > 0$ is small enough that $\widehat{w}(y) := w(y) - w(y_2) - c\lambda|y - y_2|$ satisfies

$$H(p + D\widehat{w}, y, \omega) \leq \overline{H}(p) - \frac{1}{3}\lambda \quad \text{in } U.$$

Let $V := \left\{ y \in \mathbb{R}^d \,:\, \widehat{w}(y) > -\lambda/4\delta \right\}$ and note that, in light of the fact that $\widehat{w} \leq w$, $\widehat{w}(y_2) = 0$ and $\widehat{w}(y) \leq -c\lambda|y - y_2|$, there exists $D < R \leq C/\delta$ such that

$$V \subset U \cap B(y_2, R). \tag{5.11}$$

For notational convenience, denote $\mu := \overline{H}(p)$. Since $\overline{H}(p) > 0$, according to (A.39) there exists $e \in \mathbb{R}^d$ with $|e| = 1$ such that $p \in \partial \overline{m}_\mu(e)$, that is, for every $z \in \mathbb{R}^d$,

$$\overline{m}_\mu(z) - p \cdot z \geq 0 = \overline{m}_\mu(e) - p \cdot e. \tag{5.12}$$

Define $\widehat{m}(y) := m_\mu(y, y_2 - Re, \omega) - p \cdot y$ and observe that

$$H(p + D\widehat{m}, y, \omega) = \overline{H}(p) \quad \text{in } \mathbb{R}^d \setminus \{y_2 - Re\} \supseteq V.$$

An application of the comparison principle yields

$$\widehat{w}(y_2) - \widehat{m}(y_2) \leq \sup_{y \in V} \left(\widehat{w}(y) - \widehat{m}(y) \right) = \max_{y \in \partial V} \left(\widehat{w}(y) - \widehat{m}(y) \right).$$

Using (5.10) and that $\widehat{w}(y_2) = 0$ and $\widehat{w} \equiv -\lambda/4\delta$ on ∂V, we obtain

$$\max_{y \in \partial V} \left(m_\mu(y_2, y_2 - Re, \omega) - m_\mu(y, y_2 - Re, \omega) - p \cdot (y_2 - y) \right) \geq \max_{y \in \partial V} \left(\widehat{m}(y_2) - \widehat{m}(y) \right) \geq \frac{\lambda}{4\delta}.$$

It follows that either

$$m_\mu(y_2, y_2 - Re, \omega) - \overline{m}_\mu(Re) = m_\mu(y_2, y_2 - Re, \omega) - p \cdot (Re) \geq \frac{\lambda}{8\delta} \tag{5.13}$$

or else

$$\begin{aligned} &\max_{y \in \partial V} \left(-m_\mu(y, y_2 - Re, \omega) + \overline{m}_\mu(y - y_2 + Re) \right) \\ &\qquad \geq \max_{y \in \partial V} \left(-m_\mu(y, y_2 - Re, \omega) + p \cdot (y - y_2 + Re) \right) \geq \frac{\lambda}{8\delta}. \end{aligned} \tag{5.14}$$

Using (A.11), (5.11) and that $|y_2| \le C/\lambda\delta$, we see that there exists

$$z \in K := \{c\lambda k/\delta \,:\, k \in \mathbb{Z}^d\} \cap B_{C/\lambda\delta},$$

such that either

$$m_\mu(z, z - Re, \omega) - \overline{m}_\mu(Re) \ge \frac{\lambda}{8\delta} \tag{5.15}$$

or else

$$\sup_{y \in B(z,R)} \left(-m_\mu(y, z - Re, \omega) + \overline{m}_\mu(y - z + Re)\right) \ge \frac{\lambda}{8\delta}. \tag{5.16}$$

In summary, we have shown that

$$\left\{\omega \in \Omega \,:\, -\delta v^\delta(0, \omega\,; p) \ge \overline{H}(p) + \lambda\right\} \subseteq \bigcup_{z \in K} \left(E_1(z) \cup E_2(z)\right) \tag{5.17}$$

where $E_1(z)$ is the event that (5.15) holds and $E_2(z)$ is the event that (5.16) holds, and $R \le C/\delta$ is a fixed constant. Using (A.4) and $|K| \le C\lambda^{-2d} \le C\delta^{-2d}$, we obtain

$$\mathbb{P}\left[-\delta v^\delta(0, \cdot\,; p) \ge \overline{H}(p) + \lambda\right] \le C\delta^{-2d}\left(\mathbb{P}\left[E_1(Re)\right] + \mathbb{P}\left[E_2(Re)\right]\right). \tag{5.18}$$

Applying (4.55), we find that

$$\mathbb{P}\left[E_2(Re)\right] = \mathbb{P}\left[\inf_{y \in B_R} \left(m_\mu(y, 0, \omega) - \overline{m}_\mu(y)\right) \le -\frac{\lambda}{8\delta}\right] \le CR^d \exp\left(-\frac{\mu\lambda^2}{C\delta^2 R}\right) \le C\delta^{-d} \exp\left(-\frac{\mu\lambda^2}{C\delta}\right)$$

and, if λ satisfies (2.16) for sufficiently large $C_3 > 0$, then we may apply (2.14) to get

$$\mathbb{P}\left[E_1(Re)\right] = \mathbb{P}\left[m_\mu(Re, 0, \cdot) - \overline{m}_\mu(Re) \ge \frac{\lambda}{8\delta}\right] \le \exp\left(-\frac{\mu\lambda^2}{C\delta^2 R}\right) \le \exp\left(-\frac{\mu\lambda^2}{C\delta}\right).$$

Combining the last two sets of inequalities with (5.18) yields (2.17), completing the proof. □

A covering argument now yields explicit error estimates for (5.1) in balls of radius $O\left(\delta^{-1}\right)$.

Lemma 5.1. *For each* $K > 0$*, there exist constants* $C_{16}, c_2 > 0$ *such that, for each* $p \in B_K$*,* $R > 0$ *and* $0 < \delta \le c_2$*,*

$$\mathbb{P}\left[\sup_{y \in B_{R/\delta}} -\delta v^\delta(y, \cdot\,; p) \ge \overline{H}(p) + C_{16}|\log\delta|^{\frac13}\delta^{\frac13}\right] \le R^d\delta^2, \tag{5.19}$$

and, if $\overline{H}(p) > 0$*, then*

$$\mathbb{P}\left[\inf_{y \in B_{R/\delta}} -\delta v^\delta(y, \cdot\,; p) \le \overline{H}(p) - C_{16}\left(\overline{H}(p)^{-\frac32}\delta^{\frac12} + \overline{H}(p)^{-1}\delta^{\frac13}\right)\left(1 + |\log\delta| + |\log\overline{H}(p)|\right)^{\frac12}\right] \le R^d\delta^2. \tag{5.20}$$

Proof. Since both of the estimates are obtained from the first two statements of Theorem 2 using a similar argument, we prove only (5.19). To do so, we apply (2.15) with $\lambda := A|\log\delta|^{\frac13}\delta^{\frac13}$, for $A > 0$ chosen sufficiently large, and use a simple covering argument. Notice that if $0 < \delta < \frac12$ is sufficiently small, depending on A, then $\delta \le \lambda$. There exist points $y_1, \ldots, y_N \in B_{R/\delta}$ such that

$N \leq CR^d\lambda^{-d}$ and the balls $B(y_j, \lambda/2\delta K_p)$ cover $B_{R/\delta}$. According to (B.5), (5.3) and (2.15), with $C_3 > 0$ as in (2.15), we have

$$\begin{aligned}\mathbb{P}\left[\sup_{y\in B_{R/\delta}} -\delta v^\delta(y,\cdot\,;p) \geq \overline{H}(p)+\lambda\right] &\leq \mathbb{P}\left[\max_{1\leq j\leq N} -\delta v^\delta(y_j,\cdot\,;p) \geq \overline{H}(p)+\frac{\lambda}{2}\right]\\ &\leq CN\mathbb{P}\left[-\delta v^\delta(0,\cdot\,;p) \geq \overline{H}(p)+\frac{\lambda}{2}\right]\\ &\leq CR^d\lambda^{-d}\delta^{-3d}\exp\left(-\frac{\lambda^3}{8C_3\delta}\right)\\ &\leq CR^d\delta^{-4d}\exp\left(-\frac{A^3|\log\delta|}{8C_3}\right).\end{aligned}$$

We therefore obtain (5.19) if we choose $A > 0$ so that $A^3 \geq 8C_3(4d+2)$. □

We next apply Lemma 5.1 along a certain subsequence $\delta_n \to 0$ to prove, with the help of (B.10) and the Borel-Cantelli lemma, the first two statements of Theorem 3.

Proof of Theorem 3(i) and Theorem 3(ii). The arguments for the two statements are almost identical, so we prove only (2.20). Let $R > 0$, $\delta_n = n^{-1}$ and apply (5.19) to obtain

$$\sum_{n=1}^\infty \mathbb{P}\left[\sup_{y\in B_{R/\delta_n}} -\delta_n v^{\delta_n}(y,\cdot\,;p) \geq \overline{H}(p) + C_{16}|\log\delta_n|^{\frac13}\delta_n^{\frac13}\right] \leq C + R^d \sum_{n>1/c_2}\delta_n^2 \leq C + R^d\sum_{n=1}^\infty \frac{1}{n^2} < \infty.$$

By the Borel-Cantelli lemma, we deduce that, for each $R > 0$,

$$\mathbb{P}\left[\limsup_{n\to\infty}\sup_{y\in B_{R/\delta_n}} \frac{-\delta_n v^{\delta_n}(y,\cdot\,;p)-\overline{H}(p)}{C_{16}|\log\delta_n|^{\frac13}\delta_n^{\frac13}} \leq 1\right] = 1.$$

Intersecting these events for each $R = 1,2,3,\ldots$, we find an event Ω_1 of full probability such that, for every $R > 0$ and $\omega \in \Omega_1$,

$$\limsup_{n\to\infty}\sup_{y\in B_{R/\delta_n}} \frac{-\delta_n v^{\delta_n}(y,\cdot\,;p)-\overline{H}(p)}{C_{16}|\log\delta_n|^{\frac13}\delta_n^{\frac13}} \leq 1.$$

Notice that $\delta_{n+1}/\delta_n = 1-\delta_{n+1}$ and so, according to (B.10), for any $\delta_{n+1} \leq \eta < \delta_n$ and $\omega \in \Omega$,

$$\sup_{y\in\mathbb{R}^d}\left|\delta_n v^{\delta_n}(y,\omega\,;p) - \eta v^\eta(y,\omega\,;p)\right| \leq C\delta_{n+1} \leq C\delta_n.$$

Hence for every $\omega \in \Omega_1$ we have

$$\begin{aligned}\limsup_{\delta\to 0}\sup_{y\in B_{R/\delta}} \frac{-\delta v^\delta(y,\omega\,;p)-\overline{H}(p)}{C_{16}|\log\delta|^{\frac13}\delta^{\frac13}} &= \limsup_{n\to\infty}\sup_{\delta_n\leq\eta<\delta_{n-1}}\sup_{y\in B_{R/\eta}} \frac{-\eta v^\eta(y,\omega\,;p)-\overline{H}(p)}{C_{16}|\log\eta|^{\frac13}\eta^{\frac13}}\\ &\leq \limsup_{n\to\infty}\sup_{y\in B_{2R/\delta_n}} \frac{-\delta_n v^{\delta_n}(y,\omega\,;p)-\overline{H}(p)+C\delta_n}{C_{16}|\log\delta_n|^{\frac13}\delta_n^{\frac13}} \leq 1.\end{aligned}$$ □

5.2. **The sub-ballistic regime.** We show that the behavior of $\delta v^\delta(0,\cdot\,;p)$ for p's on the flat spot $\{\overline{H}=0\}$ is determined by the distribution of $H(0,0,\cdot)$ near its maximum and that with further (quite reasonable) assumptions on this distribution, we obtain exponential error estimates and an algebraic rate of convergence for $-\delta v^\delta(0,\omega\,;p)$ to $\overline{H}(p)$.

We begin with the simple observation, which is probably well-known and essentially taken from [3], that $-\delta v^\delta(\cdot,\omega\,;p)$ is controlled pointwise from below by $H(0,\cdot,\omega)$.

Lemma 5.2. *For every $p\in\mathbb{R}^d$ and $\omega\in\Omega$,*

$$-\delta v^\delta(0,\omega\,;p)\geq \sup_{R>0}\left(\sup_{y\in B_R} H(0,y,\omega)-K_pR\delta\right), \tag{5.21}$$

with the constant $K_p>0$ defined in (B.6).

Proof. Fix $p,y\in\mathbb{R}^d$ and $\omega\in\Omega$. Due to (1.4) and (2.9), $v^\delta(\cdot,\omega\,;p)$ satisfies

$$\delta v^\delta + H(0,y,\omega)\leq \delta v^\delta + H(p+Dv^\delta,y,\omega)=0 \quad \text{in } \mathbb{R}^d. \tag{5.22}$$

While this holds in the viscosity sense, there are no derivatives in the expression on the left of (5.22), and we deduce that

$$-\delta v^\delta(y,\omega\,;p)\geq H(0,y,\omega). \tag{5.23}$$

Combining (5.23) and (5.3) yields (5.21). □

For p's on the flat spot, the rate of convergence for $-\delta v^\delta(0,\omega\,;p)$ to $0=\overline{H}(p)$ given by (5.21) is essentially optimal (see Lemma 5.5 below). We next exhibit exponential error estimates for $-\delta v^\delta(0,\cdot\,;p)$ under the additional hypothesis (2.11).

Proposition 5.3. *Assume* (2.11)*. There exist $C_{17},c_3>0$ such that, for all $\delta>0$ and $0<\lambda\leq c_3$,*

$$\mathbb{P}\left[-\delta v^\delta(0,\cdot\,;p)\leq -\lambda\right]\leq \exp\left(-\frac{\lambda^{d+\theta}}{C_{17}\delta^d}\right). \tag{5.24}$$

Proof. Fix $p\in\mathbb{R}^d$ and apply (5.21) with $R:=\lambda/(2K_p\delta)$ to discover that

$$\mathbb{P}\left[-\delta v^\delta(0,\cdot\,;p)\leq -\lambda\right]\leq \mathbb{P}\left[\sup_{y\in B_R} H(0,y,\cdot)\leq K_pR\delta-\lambda\right]=\mathbb{P}\left[\sup_{y\in B_R} H(0,y,\cdot)\leq -\frac{\lambda}{2}\right].$$

Select $y_1,\ldots,y_N\in B_R$ such that $N\geq cR^d$ and, for every $i\neq j$, $|y_i-y_j|>D$. Then (2.2) and (2.3) yield

$$\mathbb{P}\left[\sup_{y\in B_R} H(0,y,\cdot)\leq -\frac{\lambda}{2}\right]\leq \mathbb{P}\left[\sup_{1\leq j\leq N} H(0,y_j,\cdot)\leq -\frac{\lambda}{2}\right]=\prod_{1\leq j\leq N}\mathbb{P}\left[H(0,y_j,\cdot)\leq -\frac{\lambda}{2}\right].$$

Using (2.11), we find

$$\begin{aligned}\prod_{1\leq j\leq N}\mathbb{P}\left[H(0,y_j,\cdot)\leq -\frac{\lambda}{2}\right]=\left(\mathbb{P}\left[H(0,0,\cdot)\leq -\frac{\lambda}{2}\right]\right)^N &\leq \left(1-c\lambda^\theta\right)^N\\ &\leq \exp\left(-cN\lambda^\theta\right)\leq \exp\left(-c\lambda^{d+\theta}\delta^{-d}\right).\end{aligned}$$

Combining the lines above yields (5.24). □

We now obtain, under assumption (2.11), exponential error estimates and a rate of convergence, from below, for $-\delta v^\delta$ for all $p \in \mathbb{R}^d$. First, we combine (2.17) and (5.24) to obtain error estimates independent of $\overline{H}(p)$.

Proof of Theorem 2(iii). Observe that if we take $A > 0$ sufficiently large and $a > 0$ sufficiently small, then, for any $0 < \delta < a$ and $\lambda > 0$ satisfying (2.18), we have

$$\lambda \geq A\delta^{\frac{1}{6}} |\log \delta|^{\frac{1}{4}} \geq \sup_{\sigma > 0} \left(2\sigma \wedge 4C_2 \left(\sigma^{-\frac{3}{2}} \delta^{\frac{1}{2}} + \sigma^{-1} \delta^{\frac{1}{3}} \right) (1 + |\log \delta| + |\log \sigma|)^{\frac{1}{2}} \right). \tag{5.25}$$

Thus (2.18) ensures that (2.17) and (5.24) overlap in an appropriate way to yield the theorem. Indeed, for $0 < \lambda \leq c_3$, we may apply (5.24) in case $\lambda \geq 2\overline{H}(p)$, while in the case that $\lambda < 2\overline{H}(p)$, we may apply (2.17), since (5.25) ensures that $\lambda < 2\overline{H}(p)$ implies (2.16). ☐

Arguing in a similar way as in the proof of Lemma 5.1, we obtain the following result as an application (2.19). The details are left to the reader.

Lemma 5.4. *Assume* (2.11) *and let* α *and* β *be defined as in* (2.22). *There exist constants* $C_{18}, c_4 > 0$ *such that, for each* $R > 0$ *and* $0 < \delta \leq c_4$,

$$\mathbb{P}\left[\inf_{y \in B_{R/\delta}} -\delta v^\delta(y, \cdot\,; p) \leq \overline{H}(p) - C_{18} |\log \delta|^\beta \delta^\alpha \right] \leq R^d \delta^2. \tag{5.26}$$

Using (5.26) we complete the proof of Theorem 3.

Proof of Theorem 3(iii). The statement follows from (5.26) by an argument very similar to the proof of Theorem 3(i) given above. ☐

5.3. **The rate may be arbitrarily slow on the flat spot.** As explained in Appendix A, the vector $p = 0$ belongs to the flat spot: $\overline{H}(0) = 0$. We show here that (2.11) is necessary for the existence of an algebraic rate of convergence like (5.26) for the limit (5.1) at $p = 0$. Furthermore, without some assumption on the distribution of the random variable $H(0, 0, \cdot)$ near its maximum, there is no restraint on how slowly the limit (5.1) may converge for $p = 0$.

We begin by exhibiting an upper bound for $-\delta v^\delta(0, \omega\,; 0)$ to match (5.21), which shows that, for p's on the flat spot, the rate given in Lemma 5.2 is essentially optimal.

Lemma 5.5. *There exists a constant* $C_{19} \geq 1$ *such that, for every* $\omega \in \Omega$ *and* $R, \delta > 0$,

$$-\delta v^\delta(0, \omega\,; 0) \leq (-\delta R) \vee \frac{\delta R}{C_{19} + \delta R} \sup_{y \in B_R} H(0, y, \omega). \tag{5.27}$$

Proof. Fix $\omega \in \Omega$, $R, \delta > 0$ and define, for every $0 \leq \alpha \leq 1$,

$$h_R := -\sup_{y \in B_R} H(0, y, \omega) \quad \text{and} \quad h_{\alpha,R} := -\sup_{(p,y) \in B_\alpha \times B_R} H(p, y, \omega),$$

where we set $h_{\alpha,R} := h_R$ in the case that $\alpha = 0$. Observe that $h_R \geq 0$ and, due to (2.5), for any $0 \leq \alpha \leq 1$,

$$|h_R - h_{\alpha,R}| \leq C\alpha. \tag{5.28}$$

Next fix $0 \leq \alpha \leq 1$ to be selected below, define $u(x) := \alpha(R - |x|)_+$ and note that $u \in \mathcal{L}$, $|Du| \leq \alpha$ in $\mathbb{R}^d$ and $u \equiv 0$ in $\mathbb{R}^d \setminus B_R$. We conclude that

$$\delta u + H(Du, y, \omega) \leq (\delta\alpha R - h_{\alpha,R}) \vee 0 \quad \text{in } \mathbb{R}^d.$$

Choose $0 \leq \alpha \leq 1$ to be the largest number for which $\alpha\delta R \leq h_{\alpha,R} \wedge \delta R$. The comparison principle (Proposition B.1) yields that $\delta\alpha R = \delta u(0) \leq \delta v^\delta(0,\omega\,;0)$. According to (5.28),

$$\alpha \geq \frac{h_R}{C+\delta R} \wedge 1.$$

which concludes the proof. ☐

The previous lemma states that the rate $-\delta v^\delta(0,\omega\,;0)$ converges to 0 is controlled from below, up to a factor of 2, by the maximum of $H(0,\cdot,\omega)$ in the ball $B_{C_{19}/\delta}$. Using the independence assumption and an easy covering argument, we relate the latter to the distribution of $H(0,0,\omega)$ near its maximum to recover the following estimate.

Lemma 5.6. *There exists a constant $C_{20} > 0$ such that, for every $\delta > 0$ and $0 < \lambda \leq 1$,*

$$\log \mathbb{P}\left[-\delta v^\delta(0,\cdot\,;0) \leq -\lambda\right] \geq C_{20}\delta^{-d} \log\left(1 - C_{20}\lambda^{-d}\,\mathbb{P}\left[H(0,0,\cdot) > -4\lambda\right]\right), \tag{5.29}$$

where the inequality is vacuous if the argument in the logarithm on the right side is negative.

Proof. Fix $0 < \lambda \leq 1$. There exists a finite collection of points $\{y_{ij} : 1 \leq i \leq N, 1 \leq j \leq M\} \subseteq B_R$ such that $N \leq CR^d$, $M \leq C\lambda^{-d}$, B_R is covered by the balls $B(y_{ij}, c\lambda)$ and $|y_{ij} - y_{kj}| > D$ if $i \neq k$. According to (2.2), (2.3) and (2.5), we have

$$\begin{aligned}\mathbb{P}\left[\sup_{y\in B_R} H(0,y,\cdot) \leq -2\lambda\right] &\geq \mathbb{P}\left[\sup_{1\leq i\leq N}\,\sup_{1\leq j\leq M} H(0,y_{ij},\cdot) \leq -4\lambda\right] \\ &= \mathbb{P}\left[\sup_{1\leq j\leq M} H(0,y_{1j},\cdot) \leq -4\lambda\right]^N \geq \big(1 - M\mathbb{P}\left[H(0,0,\cdot) > -4\lambda\right]\big)^N.\end{aligned}$$

Setting $R := C_{19}/\delta$, with $C_{19} \geq 1$ defined in Lemma 5.5, applying (5.27) and taking the logarithm of the resulting expression yields (5.29). ☐

We next show that the assumption (2.11) is essentially necessarily for (5.1) to have an algebraic rate of convergence at $p = 0$.

Proposition 5.7. *Assume, contrary to (2.11), that there exists $C, c > 0$ and $\theta > d$ such that, for every $0 < \lambda \leq c$,*

$$\mathbb{P}\left[H(0,0,\cdot) > -\lambda\right] \leq C\lambda^\theta. \tag{5.30}$$

Then there exists $c_5 > 0$ such that, for every $0 < \delta \leq c_5$,

$$\mathbb{P}\left[-\delta v^\delta(0,\cdot\,;0) \leq -\delta^\gamma\right] \geq c_5 \quad \textit{for} \quad \gamma := d/(\theta - d). \tag{5.31}$$

Moreover, for ω belonging to an event of full probability, we have, for every $\eta > \gamma$,

$$\liminf_{\delta\to 0} \frac{\delta v^\delta(0,\omega\,;0)}{\delta^\eta} = +\infty. \tag{5.32}$$

Proof. Let $\lambda > 0$. Using the elementary inequality $-2t \leq \log(1-t)$ for $0 \leq t \leq \frac{1}{2}$, we apply (5.29) and (5.30) to obtain, for sufficiently small $\delta, \lambda > 0$,

$$\log \mathbb{P}\left[-\delta v^\delta(0,\cdot\,;0) \leq -\lambda\right] \geq C\delta^{-d}\log\left(1 - C\lambda^{\theta-d}\right) \geq -C\delta^{-d}\lambda^{\theta-d}.$$

Setting $\lambda := \delta^\beta$ yields (5.31) for sufficiently small $\delta > 0$, while on the other hand setting $\lambda = \delta^\alpha$ for $\alpha > \beta$, applying the Borel-Cantelli lemma along a subsequence and arguing as in the proof of Theorem 3 yields (5.32). ☐

It is clear from (5.29) that, if $\mathbb{P}\left[H(0,0,\cdot) > -\lambda\right]$ decays to 0 very quickly as $\lambda \to 0$, then $-\delta v^\delta(0,\omega\,;0)$ will converge to zero very slowly. We conclude this section by exhibiting an example demonstrating an arbitrarily slow rate.

Example 5.8. Let $\rho : [0,1] \to [0,\infty)$ be a given increasing continuous function with $\rho(0) = 0$. We will construct a Hamiltonian H, satisfying (2.10), such that

$$\liminf_{\delta\to 0} \frac{\delta v^\delta(0,\omega\,;p)}{\rho(\delta)} \geq 1 \quad \text{almost surely.} \tag{5.33}$$

According to (5.29), it suffices to exhibit an H for which

$$C_{20} \log\Big(1 - C_{20}\rho(\delta)^{-d}\, \mathbb{P}\left[H(0,0,\cdot) > -4\rho(\delta)\right]\Big) \geq -\delta^{d+2}. \tag{5.34}$$

Indeed, (5.29) and (5.34) yield

$$\mathbb{P}\left[\delta v^\delta(0,\cdot\,;0) \geq \rho(\delta)\right] \geq \exp(-C\delta^2) \geq 1 - C\delta^2$$

for $\delta > 0$ sufficiently small. Then the Borel-Cantelli lemma and an argument similar to the proof of Theorem 3, using (B.10), give (5.33).

It is easy to check that for (5.34), it suffices to have

$$\mathbb{P}\left[H(0,0,\cdot) > -\sigma\right] \leq c\sigma^d \left(\rho^{-1}(\sigma)\right)^{d+2} =: \widehat{\rho}(\sigma), \tag{5.35}$$

and so we need to construct a Hamiltonian with a very thin distribution near its maximum. This is quite simple. We may take, for example,

$$H(p,y,\omega) := \frac{1}{2}|p|^2 - \phi(V(y,\omega))$$

where V is a Poissonian potential (see for example [34]) and $\phi : [0,\infty) \to (0,\infty)$ is a continuous, decreasing function such that $\phi(t)$ decays very slowly to 0 as $t \to \infty$ (the precise rate of decay required can be explicitly calculated in terms of $\widehat{\rho}$). We leave it to the interested reader to fill in the details.

5.4. Uniform error estimates for the approximate cell problem.

The proofs of Theorems 4 and 5, given in the next section, depend on the following extensions of Theorems 2 and 3 which hold uniformly for bounded $|p|$ and for y in balls of radius $O(\delta^{-N})$, for any $N \geq 1$. We omit the arguments, since the error estimates follow easily from an application of Theorem 2 combined with (B.5) and a routine covering argument, and then the convergence rates from the latter using the nearly same argument as in the proof of Theorem 3.

Proposition 5.9. *For each $K > 0$, there exist constants $C_{21}, c_6 > 0$ such that, for each $R > 0$, the following hold:*

(i) *For every $0 < \lambda \leq 1$ and $0 < \delta \leq c_6\lambda$,*

$$\mathbb{P}\left[\sup_{(y,p)\in B_R\times B_K} \Big(-\delta v^\delta(y,\cdot\,;p) - \overline{H}(p)\Big) \geq \lambda\right] \leq C_{21} R^d \delta^{-5d} \exp\left(-\frac{\lambda^3}{C_{21}\delta}\right). \tag{5.36}$$

(ii) *If (2.11) holds and $\lambda, \delta > 0$ satisfy $0 < \delta \leq c_6\lambda$ and*

$$\lambda \geq C_{21}\delta^{\frac{1}{6}}|\log\delta|^{\frac{1}{4}}, \tag{5.37}$$

then

$$\mathbb{P}\left[\inf_{(y,p)\in B_R\times B_K}\left(-\delta v^\delta(y,\cdot\,;p)-\overline{H}(p)\right)\le -\lambda\right] \le C_{21}R^d\delta^{-5d}\exp\left(-\frac{1}{C_{21}}\left(\frac{\lambda^3}{\delta}\wedge\frac{\lambda^{d+\theta}}{\delta^d}\right)\right). \quad (5.38)$$

Proposition 5.10. *There exists an event $\Omega_3\in\mathcal{F}$ of full probability such that, for every $\omega\in\Omega_3$, the following hold:*

(i) *For every $R,K>0$ and $N\ge 1$,*

$$\limsup_{\delta\to 0}\ \sup_{y\in B_{R/\delta^N}}\ \sup_{p\in B_K}\frac{-\delta v^\delta(y,\omega\,;p)-\overline{H}(p)}{\delta^{\frac{1}{3}}|\log\delta|^{\frac{1}{3}}}<\infty. \quad (5.39)$$

(ii) *If (2.11) holds and we define α and β as in (2.22), then, for every $R,K>0$ and $N\ge 1$,*

$$\liminf_{\delta\to 0}\ \inf_{y\in B_{R/\delta^N}}\ \sup_{p\in B_K}\frac{-\delta v^\delta(y,\omega\,;p)-\overline{H}(p)}{\delta^{\alpha}|\log\delta|^{\beta}}>-\infty. \quad (5.40)$$

6. Error estimates for homogenization

We now present the proofs of Theorems 4 and 5. The main step is to precisely quantify how the δv^δ's control the u^ε's, so that we may apply the results of the previous section to obtain error estimates and a rate of convergence for the latter.

For each $\varepsilon,T>0$, let $u^\varepsilon=u^\varepsilon(\cdot,\cdot,\omega), u=u(\cdot,\cdot)\in \mathrm{BUC}(\mathbb{R}^d\times[0,T])$ be the unique solutions of

$$\begin{cases} u^\varepsilon_t+H\left(Du^\varepsilon,\dfrac{x}{\varepsilon},\omega\right)=0 & \text{in } \mathbb{R}^d\times(0,\infty),\\ u^\varepsilon(\cdot,0,\omega)=u_0, \end{cases} \quad \text{and} \quad \begin{cases} u_t+\overline{H}\left(Du\right)=0 & \text{in } \mathbb{R}^d\times(0,\infty),\\ u(\cdot,0)=u_0, \end{cases}$$

where $u_0\in C^{0,1}(\mathbb{R}^d)$ is the given initial data with $\|u_0\|_{C^{0,1}(\mathbb{R}^d)}\le K$.

It turns out (see, e.g., [6]) that there exists a constant $L>0$, depending on K and the assumptions for H, such that, for all $\varepsilon>0$, $x,y\in\mathbb{R}^d$, $s,t\ge 0$ and $\omega\in\Omega$,

$$|u^\varepsilon(x,t,\omega)-u^\varepsilon(y,s,\omega)|\le L\left(|x-y|+|s-t|\right). \quad (6.1)$$

and

$$|u(x,t)-u(y,s)|\le L\left(|x-y|+|s-t|\right). \quad (6.2)$$

These estimates are derived principally from the coercivity of H. Recall that, due to (5.2) and (B.12), the effective Hamiltonian shares the same rate of coercivity assumed in (2.6). It also follows easily from this that for each $\varepsilon>0$, $x\in\mathbb{R}^d$, $0\le t\le T$ and $\omega\in\Omega$,

$$|u(x,t)|+|u^\varepsilon(x,t,\omega)|\le K+LT\le C(1+T). \quad (6.3)$$

The important link between the δv^δ's and the u^ε's is summarized in the following lemma. Then Theorems 4 and 5 follow relatively easily from it and Propositions 5.9 and 5.10. The basic idea is that the event that $|u^\varepsilon(x,t,\omega)-u(x,t)|$ is large should only be observed if $|\delta v^\delta+\overline{H}(p)|$ is also large. The proof, which is rather technical and lengthy, follows along the lines of [8] with necessary modifications to deal with to the lack of uniform estimates on the difference between $-\delta v^\delta$ and $\overline{H}(p)$. It essentially consists of quantifying the perturbed test function method [13] to argue that, if $-\delta v^\delta$ is close to $\overline{H}(p)$, then, up to an appropriate error, it properly captures the oscillations of u^ε, that is,

$$u(x,t) \approx u^\varepsilon(x,t,\omega) - \varepsilon v^\delta\left(\frac{x}{\varepsilon}, \omega\,; Du(x,t)\right), \qquad \varepsilon \ll \delta. \tag{6.4}$$

Rather than apply the comparison principle, we must use the proof of it. This is due to the fact that, since u is not in general C^1, we cannot insert $p = Du(x,t)$ into $v^\delta(x,\omega\,;p)$. There are other technical difficulties (the presence of *three* nonsmooth functions, the fact that v^δ is not smooth in p) which we handle by the standard viscosity theoretic technique of doubling (or rather tripling) the variables.

Lemma 6.1. *For each $K > 0$, there exist $C_{22}, L > 0$ such that, for every $\lambda, T, \varepsilon, \delta > 0$ satisfying*

$$\lambda \le 1, \quad T \ge 1, \quad \varepsilon \le \lambda T \quad \textit{and} \quad \frac{C_{22}\varepsilon}{T\lambda^2} \le \delta \tag{6.5}$$

and each initial datum $u_0 \in C^{0,1}(\mathbb{R}^d)$ with $\|u_0\|_{C^{0,1}(\mathbb{R}^d)} \le K$, we have

$$\left\{\omega \in \Omega \,:\, \inf_{x\in B_T} \inf_{0<t\le T} \left(u^\varepsilon(x,t,\omega) - u(x,t)\right) < -C_{22}\lambda T\right\} \\ \subseteq \left\{\omega \in \Omega \,:\, \sup_{|y|\le C_{22}\delta\lambda T^2/\varepsilon^2} \sup_{|p|\le L} \left(-\delta v^\delta(y,\omega\,;p) - \overline{H}(p)\right) \ge \lambda\right\}, \tag{6.6}$$

and

$$\left\{\omega \in \Omega \,:\, \sup_{x\in B_T} \sup_{0\le t\le T} \left(u^\varepsilon(x,t,\omega) - u(x,t)\right) > C_{22}\lambda T\right\} \\ \subseteq \left\{\omega \in \Omega \,:\, \inf_{|y|\le C_{22}\delta\lambda T^2/\varepsilon^2} \inf_{|p|\le L} \left(-\delta v^\delta(y,\omega\,;p) - \overline{H}(p)\right) \le -\lambda\right\}. \tag{6.7}$$

Proof. Since the arguments for (6.6) and (6.7) are nearly identical, we prove only (6.7).

Define $\zeta : \mathbb{R}^d \to \mathbb{R}^d$ by

$$\zeta(x) := \frac{L \wedge |x|}{|x|} x,$$

and notice that $\zeta(x)$ has the same direction as x and

$$|\zeta(x)| = L \wedge |x| \quad \text{and} \quad |\zeta(x) - \zeta(y)| \le |x-y|. \tag{6.8}$$

Fix $T, \lambda, \varepsilon, \delta > 0$ satisfying

$$\lambda \le 1, \quad T \ge 1, \quad \varepsilon \le \lambda T \quad \text{and} \quad \frac{A\varepsilon}{T\lambda^2} \le \delta \tag{6.9}$$

where the constant $A \ge 2$ is selected below. Also fix parameters $\alpha, \gamma > 0$ to be chosen below and consider the auxiliary function $\Phi : \mathbb{R}^d \times \mathbb{R}^d \times [0,T] \times [0,T] \times \Omega \to \mathbb{R}$ given by

$$\Phi(x,y,t,s,\omega) := u^\varepsilon(x,t,\omega) - u(y,s) - \varepsilon v^\delta\left(\frac{x}{\varepsilon}, \omega\,; \zeta\left(\frac{x-y}{\alpha}\right)\right) - \frac{1}{2\alpha}|x-y|^2 - \frac{1}{2\varepsilon}(t-s)^2 \\ - \lambda s - \gamma\left(1+|x|^2\right)^{\frac{1}{2}} + \gamma. \tag{6.10}$$

Using (5.2), (6.3) and (6.8), we have, for each $(x,y,t,s,\omega) \in \mathbb{R}^d \times \mathbb{R}^d \times [0,T] \times [0,T] \times \Omega$,

$$|\Phi(x,y,t,s,\omega)| \le C(1+T) + C\varepsilon\delta^{-1} - \frac{1}{2\alpha}|x-y|^2 - \frac{1}{2\varepsilon}(t-s)^2 - \lambda s - \gamma\left(1+|x|^2\right)^{\frac{1}{2}} + \gamma. \tag{6.11}$$

It follows that, for each $\omega \in \Omega$, the function $\Phi(\cdot,\omega)$ attains its global maximum at some point of $\mathbb{R}^d \times \mathbb{R}^d \times [0,T] \times [0,T]$. Set

$$M(\omega) := \max_{\mathbb{R}^d\times\mathbb{R}^d\times[0,T]\times[0,T]} \Phi(\cdot,\omega)$$

and denote by $E \in \mathcal{F}$ the event that the global maximum of $\Phi(\cdot,\omega)$ is attained by some point (x,y,t,s) with either $t = 0$ or $s = 0$; that is,

$$E := \left\{ \omega \in \Omega \,:\, M(\omega) = \sup_{(x,y,t,s)\in\mathbb{R}^d\times\mathbb{R}^d\times[0,T]\times[0,T]} \Phi(x,y,0,s,\omega) \vee \Phi(x,y,t,0,\omega) \right\}$$

Note that, for notational simplicity, we omit the dependence of E on α and ε.

The lemma follows from the fact that, under an appropriate choice of the parameters,

$$\sup_{\omega\in E} \sup_{x\in B_T} \sup_{0<t\le T} \left(u^\varepsilon(x,t,\omega) - u(x,t)\right) \le C\lambda T. \tag{6.12}$$

and, for some $R \le C\delta\lambda T^2/\varepsilon^2$,

$$\Omega \setminus E \subseteq \left\{ \omega \in \Omega \,:\, \inf_{(y,p)\in B_R\times B_L} \left(-\delta v^\delta(y,\omega\,;p) - \overline{H}(p) \right) \le -\frac{\lambda}{2} \right\}. \tag{6.13}$$

Proving (6.12) is relatively easy, while (6.13) involves a more involved comparison argument.

Before we begin the proof of (6.13), we record two elementary estimates that necessarily hold at any global maximum point of $\Phi(\cdot,\omega)$ and for any $\omega \in \Omega$. For the moment, we fix $\omega \in \Omega$ and a point $(x_0,y_0,t_0,s_0) \in \mathbb{R}^d \times \mathbb{R}^d \times [0,T] \times [0,T]$ satisfying

$$\Phi(x_0,y_0,t_0,s_0,\omega) = M(\omega). \tag{6.14}$$

The inequality $\Phi(x_0,y_0,t_0,s_0,\omega) \ge \Phi(0,0,0,0,\omega)$ yields, in light of (6.11), that

$$\gamma|x_0| + \frac{1}{2\varepsilon}(t_0 - s_0)^2 \le C(1+T) + \frac{C\varepsilon}{\delta} \le CT. \tag{6.15}$$

If $s_0 \ne 0$, then by (6.2) and that $s \mapsto u(y,s) + (s-t)^2/2\varepsilon$ has a local minimum at $s = s_0$, we deduce that

$$|s_0 - t_0| \le (L+\lambda)\varepsilon \le (L+1)\varepsilon. \tag{6.16}$$

The inequality (6.16) is also satisfied for a similar reason if $t_0 \ne 0$, and trivially if $s_0 = t_0 = 0$. We also claim that

$$|x_0 - y_0| \le L\alpha. \tag{6.17}$$

If not, then $y \mapsto \zeta((x_0 - y)/\alpha)$ is constant in a neighborhood of y_0 and we obtain from (6.14) that

$$y \mapsto u(y,s_0) + \frac{1}{2\alpha}|x_0 - y|^2 \quad \text{has a local minimum at } y = y_0.$$

Due to (6.2), we conclude that $|x_0 - y_0| \le L\alpha$, which is a contradiction. In particular,

$$\zeta\left(\frac{x_0 - y_0}{\alpha}\right) = \frac{x_0 - y_0}{\alpha}. \tag{6.18}$$

We now commence with the proof of (6.13), following the classical argument of the proof of the comparison principle for viscosity solutions and [8] . Fix $\omega \in \Omega\backslash E$ and select a point $(x_0,y_0,t_0,s_0) \in$

$\mathbb{R}^d \times \mathbb{R}^d \times (0,T] \times (0,T]$ such that (6.14) holds. The first step is to fix $(x,t) = (x_0,t_0)$, allow (y,s) to vary, and to use the equation for u. The goal is to derive (6.23), below. From (6.14), we see that

$$(y,s) \mapsto u(y,s) + \varepsilon v^\delta \left(\frac{x_0}{\varepsilon}, \omega\,; \zeta\left(\frac{x_0-y}{\alpha} \right) \right) + \frac{1}{2\alpha}|x_0-y|^2 + \frac{1}{2\varepsilon}(t_0-s)^2 + \lambda s$$
$$\text{has a local minimum at } (y,s) = (y_0,s_0). \tag{6.19}$$

According to (B.9) and (6.8),

$$\varepsilon v^\delta \left(\frac{x_0}{\varepsilon}, \omega\,; \zeta\left(\frac{x_0-y}{\alpha} \right) \right) - \varepsilon v^\delta \left(\frac{x_0}{\varepsilon}, \omega\,; \zeta\left(\frac{x_0-y_0}{\alpha} \right) \right)$$
$$\leq \frac{C\varepsilon}{\delta} \left| \zeta\left(\frac{x_0-y}{\alpha} \right) - \zeta\left(\frac{x_0-y_0}{\alpha} \right) \right| \leq \frac{C\varepsilon|y-y_0|}{\delta\alpha}. \tag{6.20}$$

Using (6.19), (6.20), the fact that equality holds in (6.20) at $y = y_0$ and by enlarging $C > 0$ slightly, we obtain that

$$(y,s) \mapsto u(y,s) + \frac{1}{2\alpha}|x_0-y|^2 + \frac{1}{2\varepsilon}(t_0-s)^2 + \lambda s + C\frac{\varepsilon}{\delta\alpha}|y-y_0|$$
$$\text{has a strict local minimum at } (y,s) = (y_0,s_0). \tag{6.21}$$

It follows that, for all sufficiently small $\beta > 0$, there exist $(y_\beta, s_\beta) \in \mathbb{R}^d \times [0,T]$ such that $(y_\beta,s_\beta) \to (y_0,s_0)$ as $\beta \to 0$ and

$$(y,s) \mapsto u(y,s) + \frac{1}{2\alpha}|x_0-y|^2 + \frac{1}{2\varepsilon}(t_0-s)^2 + \lambda s + C\frac{\varepsilon}{\delta\alpha}\left(\beta + |y-y_0|^2\right)^{\frac{1}{2}}$$
$$\text{has a local minimum at } (y,s) = (y_\beta,s_\beta). \tag{6.22}$$

Using the equation for u, we obtain

$$-\lambda + \frac{1}{\varepsilon}(t_0 - s_\beta) + \overline{H}\left(\frac{x_0-y_\beta}{\alpha} - Q_\beta \right) \geq 0,$$

where $Q_\beta := C\frac{\varepsilon}{\delta\alpha}\left(\beta + |y_\beta-y_0|^2\right)^{-\frac{1}{2}}(y_\beta - y_0)$. Since $|Q_\beta| \leq C\varepsilon/\delta\alpha$, the Lipschitz continuity of $\overline{H}$ yields

$$-\lambda + \frac{1}{\varepsilon}(t_0 - s_\beta) + \overline{H}\left(\frac{x_0-y_\beta}{\alpha} \right) \geq -C\frac{\varepsilon}{\delta\alpha},$$

and, after letting $\beta \to 0$, we find

$$-\lambda + \frac{1}{\varepsilon}(t_0 - s_0) + \overline{H}\left(\frac{x_0-y_0}{\alpha} \right) \geq -C\frac{\varepsilon}{\delta\alpha}. \tag{6.23}$$

We next fix $(y,s) = (y_0,s_0)$ and let (x,t) vary, in order to use the equations for u^ε and v^δ. The intermediate goal is to prove (6.28), below, to compliment (6.23). This leads to some analysis that is a little more complicated that what we have just performed above to produce (6.23), due to the fact that we have two (in general, nonsmooth) functions u^ε and v^δ which depend on the variable x. This sort of technical difficulty is typically handled using an "iterated" perturbed test function argument (an idea introduced in [13]). We need to quantify this idea, and so, following [8], we fix another parameter $\sigma > 0$ (which will be sent to zero shortly) and introduce a second auxiliary function $\Psi : \mathbb{R}^d \times \mathbb{R}^d \times [0,T] \to \mathbb{R}$ defined by

$$\begin{aligned}\Psi(x,z,t) := u^\varepsilon(x,t,\omega) - \varepsilon v^\delta\left(\frac{z}{\varepsilon},\omega\,;\zeta\left(\frac{z-y_0}{\alpha}\right)\right) - \frac{1}{2\alpha}|x-y_0|^2 - \frac{1}{2\varepsilon}(t-s_0)^2 \\ - \gamma\left(1+|x|^2\right)^{\frac12} - \frac{1}{2\sigma}|z-x|^2 - \gamma\left(1+|x-x_0|^2\right)^{\frac12}. \quad (6.24)\end{aligned}$$

The last term in (6.24) provides some strictness and therefore, by (6.14), there exist points $(x_\sigma,z_\sigma,t_\sigma) \in \mathbb{R}^d \times \mathbb{R}^d \times [0,T]$ such that $(x_\sigma,z_\sigma,t_\sigma) \to (x_0,x_0,t_0)$ as $\sigma \to 0$ and

$$\Psi(x_\sigma,z_\sigma,t_\sigma) = \sup_{\mathbb{R}^d\times\mathbb{R}^d\times[0,T]} \Psi.$$

Freezing $z = z_\sigma$ and letting (x,t) vary, we have

$$(x,t) \mapsto u^\varepsilon(x,t) - \frac{1}{2\alpha}|x-y_0|^2 - \frac{1}{2\varepsilon}(t-s_0)^2 - \gamma\left(1+|x|^2\right)^{\frac12} - \frac{1}{2\sigma}|z_\sigma - x|^2 - \gamma\left(1+|x-x_0|^2\right)^{\frac12}$$
$$\text{has a local maximum at } (x,t) = (x_\sigma,t_\sigma).$$

It follows from the equation for u^ε that

$$\frac{1}{\varepsilon}(t_\sigma - s_0) + H\left(\frac{x_\sigma - y_0}{\alpha} + \frac{x_\sigma - z_\sigma}{\sigma} + P_\sigma, \frac{x_\sigma}{\varepsilon},\omega\right) \le 0,$$

where $P_\sigma := \gamma\left(1+|x_\sigma|^2\right)^{-\frac12} x_\sigma + \gamma\left(1+|x_\sigma-x_0|^2\right)^{-\frac12}(x_\sigma - x_0)$. Since $|P_\sigma| \le C\gamma$, we use (2.5) to obtain

$$\frac{1}{\varepsilon}(t_\sigma - s_0) + H\left(\frac{x_\sigma - y_0}{\alpha} + \frac{x_\sigma - z_\sigma}{\sigma}, \frac{x_\sigma}{\varepsilon},\omega\right) \le C\gamma. \quad (6.25)$$

On the other hand, freezing $(x,t) = (x_\sigma,t_\sigma)$ and letting z vary, we get

$$z \mapsto \varepsilon v^\delta\left(\frac{z}{\varepsilon},\omega\,;\zeta\left(\frac{z-y_0}{\alpha}\right)\right) + \frac{1}{2\sigma}|z-x_\sigma|^2 \quad \text{has a local minimum at } z = z_\sigma.$$

According to (6.8),

$$\left|\zeta\left(\frac{z-y_0}{\alpha}\right) - \zeta\left(\frac{z_\sigma - y_0}{\alpha}\right)\right| \le \frac{C}{\alpha}|z-z_\sigma|. \quad (6.26)$$

with equality at $z = z_\sigma$. Hence by using (B.9) again and enlarging C slightly, we obtain

$$z \mapsto \varepsilon v^\delta\left(\frac{z}{\varepsilon},\omega\,;\zeta\left(\frac{z_\sigma-y_0}{\alpha}\right)\right) + \frac{1}{2\sigma}|z-x_\sigma|^2 + C\frac{\varepsilon}{\delta\alpha}|z-z_\sigma|$$
$$\text{has a strict local minimum at } z = z_\sigma.$$

Thus we can find points $z_{\sigma,\kappa} \to z_\sigma$ as $\kappa \to 0$, such that

$$z \mapsto \varepsilon v^\delta\left(\frac{z}{\varepsilon},\omega\,;\zeta\left(\frac{z_\sigma-y_0}{\alpha}\right)\right) + \frac{1}{2\sigma}|z-x_\sigma|^2 + C\frac{\varepsilon}{\delta\alpha}\left(\kappa + |z-z_\sigma|^2\right)^{\frac12}$$
$$\text{has a local minimum at } z = z_{\sigma,\kappa}.$$

Using the equation for v^δ, we discover that

$$\delta v^\delta\left(\frac{z_{\sigma,\kappa}}{\varepsilon},\omega\,;\zeta\left(\frac{z_\sigma-y_0}{\alpha}\right)\right) + H\left(\zeta\left(\frac{z_\sigma-y_0}{\alpha}\right) + \frac{x_\sigma - z_{\sigma,\kappa}}{\sigma} - P_{\sigma,\kappa}, \frac{z_{\sigma,\kappa}}{\varepsilon},\omega\right) \ge 0,$$

where $P_{\sigma,\kappa} := C\frac{\varepsilon}{\delta\alpha}\left(\kappa + |z_{\sigma,\kappa} - z_\sigma|^2\right)^{-\frac{1}{2}}(z_{\sigma,\kappa} - z_\sigma)$. Since $|P_{\sigma,\kappa}| \le C\varepsilon/\delta\alpha$, we use (2.5) to get

$$\delta v^\delta\left(\frac{z_{\sigma,\kappa}}{\varepsilon}, \omega\,; \zeta\left(\frac{z_\sigma - y_0}{\alpha}\right)\right) + H\left(\zeta\left(\frac{z_\sigma - y_0}{\alpha}\right) + \frac{x_\sigma - z_{\sigma,\kappa}}{\sigma}, \frac{z_{\sigma,\kappa}}{\varepsilon}, \omega\right) \ge -C\frac{\varepsilon}{\delta\alpha}.$$

Letting $\kappa \to 0$ yields

$$\delta v^\delta\left(\frac{z_\sigma}{\varepsilon}, \omega\,; \zeta\left(\frac{z_\sigma - y_0}{\alpha}\right)\right) + H\left(\zeta\left(\frac{z_\sigma - y_0}{\alpha}\right) + \frac{x_\sigma - z_\sigma}{\sigma}, \frac{z_\sigma}{\varepsilon}, \omega\right) \ge -C\frac{\varepsilon}{\delta\alpha}. \tag{6.27}$$

Comparing (6.25) and (6.27), using (2.5), (B.9) and (6.26) and then sending $\sigma \to 0$ yields

$$\delta v^\delta\left(\frac{x_0}{\varepsilon}, \omega\,; \frac{x_0 - y_0}{\alpha}\right) \ge \frac{1}{\varepsilon}(t_0 - s_0) - C\frac{\varepsilon}{\delta\alpha} - C\gamma. \tag{6.28}$$

We now combine (6.23) and (6.28) to deduce, upon choosing $\gamma := \varepsilon/(\delta\alpha)$, that

$$-\delta v^\delta\left(\frac{x_0}{\varepsilon}, \omega\,; \frac{x_0 - y_0}{\alpha}\right) \le \overline{H}\left(\frac{x_0 - y_0}{\alpha}\right) + C\frac{\varepsilon}{\delta\alpha} - \lambda.$$

Select $\alpha := \lambda T$ to deduce that, for every $\delta \ge A\varepsilon/T\lambda^2 = A\varepsilon/(\alpha\lambda)$, we have $A\varepsilon/\delta\alpha \le \lambda$, and hence

$$-\delta v^\delta\left(\frac{x_0}{\varepsilon}, \omega\,; \frac{x_0 - y_0}{\alpha}\right) \le \overline{H}\left(\frac{x_0 - y_0}{\alpha}\right) - \frac{1}{2}\lambda$$

provided that $A \ge 2$ is chosen sufficiently large. In light of (6.15) and (6.17), we have shown that

$$\Omega \setminus E \subseteq \left\{\omega \in \Omega \,:\, \inf_{y \in B_R} \inf_{p \in B_L}\left(-\delta v^\delta(y, \omega\,; p) - \overline{H}(p)\right) \le -\frac{1}{2}\lambda\right\}, \tag{6.29}$$

where

$$R := \frac{|x_0|}{\varepsilon} \le \frac{CT}{\gamma\varepsilon} = \frac{C\delta\lambda T^2}{\varepsilon^2},$$

and we have proved (6.13).

We turn our attention to (6.12). Note that $\delta \ge A\varepsilon/T\lambda^2 \ge A\varepsilon/T\lambda$ and $2\gamma \le \lambda$ since $A \ge 2$. Therefore, for any $\omega \in \Omega$, $x \in B_T$ and $0 \le t \le T$,

$$\begin{aligned} u^\varepsilon(x,t,\omega) - u(x,t) &= \Phi(x,x,t,t,\omega) + \varepsilon v^\delta(x,\omega\,;0) + \lambda t + \gamma(1+|x|^2)^{\frac{1}{2}} - \gamma \\ &\le M(\omega) + C\varepsilon\delta^{-1} + \lambda T + \gamma T \le M(\omega) + 3\lambda T. \end{aligned} \tag{6.30}$$

Fix $\omega \in E$ and let $(x_0, y_0, t_0, s_0) \in \mathbb{R}^d \times \mathbb{R}^d \times [0,T] \times [0,T]$ be a point which satisfies (6.14) and such that either $t_0 = 0$ or $s_0 = 0$. If $t_0 = 0$, then using (6.16), (6.17), (6.9) and the assumption that $0 < \varepsilon \le \lambda T$,

$$\begin{aligned} M(\omega) = \Phi(x_0,y_0,t_0,s_0,\omega) &\le u_0(x_0) - u(y_0,s_0) - \varepsilon v^\delta\left(\frac{x_0}{\varepsilon}, \omega\,; \frac{x_0 - y_0}{\alpha}\right) \\ &\le L|x_0 - y_0| + Ls_0 + C\varepsilon\delta^{-1} \le L^2\alpha + C(L+1)\varepsilon + C\varepsilon\delta^{-1} \le C\lambda T. \end{aligned}$$

If $s_0 = 0$, we also get the bound $M(\omega) \le C\lambda T$ via a similar observation. Combining this with (6.30), we obtain

$$\sup_{x \in B_T} \sup_{0 < t \le T} \left(u^\varepsilon(x,t,\omega) - u(x,t)\right) \le C\lambda T.$$

This completes the proof of (6.12) and thus that of (6.7). □

We are now ready to complete the proofs of our main results.

Proof of Theorem 4. The theorem is easily obtained from the combination of Lemma 6.1 and Proposition 5.9. For example, to prove (i), we take $\delta := C_{22}\varepsilon/T\lambda^2$ and check that $\lambda \geq C\varepsilon^{\frac{1}{3}}$ for large enough $C > 0$ and $T \geq 1$ imply that $0 < \delta \leq c_6\lambda$. Thus we may apply (5.36) to (6.6). To prove (ii), we define δ in the same way and check that (2.27) implies (5.37) so that the combination of (5.38) and (6.7) yields the estimate. □

Proof of Theorem 5. The result follows from a combination of Lemma 6.1 and Proposition 5.10. We first prove (i). Define, for each $\varepsilon > 0$,

$$\lambda(\varepsilon) := A\varepsilon^{\frac{1}{5}}|\log\varepsilon|^{\frac{1}{5}} \qquad \text{and} \qquad \delta(\varepsilon) := C_{22}\varepsilon/T\lambda(\varepsilon)^2,$$

where $A \geq 1$ will be selected below. Notice that, for large A,

$$\lambda(\varepsilon) \geq cA^2\delta(\varepsilon)^{\frac{1}{3}}\left|\log\delta(\varepsilon)\right|^{\frac{1}{3}} \geq A\delta(\varepsilon)^{\frac{1}{3}}\left|\log\delta(\varepsilon)\right|^{\frac{1}{3}}.$$

According to (6.6),

$$\begin{aligned}
&\bigcap_{\eta>0}\bigcup_{0<\varepsilon\leq\eta}\left\{\omega\in\Omega\,:\,\inf_{x\in B_T}\inf_{0<t\leq T}\left(u^\varepsilon(x,t,\omega)-u(x,t)\right)\leq -C_{22}T\lambda(\varepsilon)\right\}\\
&\qquad\subseteq\bigcap_{\eta>0}\bigcup_{0<\varepsilon\leq\eta}\left\{\omega\in\Omega\,:\,\sup_{|y|\leq C_{22}\delta(\varepsilon)\lambda(\varepsilon)T^2/\varepsilon^2}\ \sup_{|p|\leq L}\left(-\delta(\varepsilon)v^{\delta(\varepsilon)}(y,\omega\,;p)-\overline{H}(p)\right)\geq\lambda(\varepsilon)\right\}\\
&\qquad\subseteq\bigcap_{\eta>0}\bigcup_{0<\varepsilon\leq\eta}\left\{\omega\in\Omega\,:\,\sup_{|y|\leq CT/\varepsilon\lambda(\varepsilon)}\ \sup_{|p|\leq L}\left(-\delta(\varepsilon)v^{\delta(\varepsilon)}(y,\omega\,;p)-\overline{H}(p)\right)\geq A\delta(\varepsilon)^{\frac{1}{2}}\left|\log\delta(\varepsilon)\right|^{\frac{1}{2}}\right\}.
\end{aligned}$$

If we choose A large enough, then (5.39) yields that the last event is of probability zero, where we have used $n = 2$ in (5.39) and the fact that $\varepsilon\lambda(\varepsilon) \geq \delta(\varepsilon)^2$ for small enough ε. We deduce that

$$\mathbb{P}\left[\liminf_{\varepsilon\to 0}\ \inf_{x\in B_T}\ \inf_{0<t\leq T}\frac{u^\varepsilon(x,t,\cdot)-u(x,t)}{\lambda(\varepsilon)}\geq -T\right]=1.$$

This completes the proof of (i).

To prove (ii), we define instead

$$\lambda(\varepsilon) := A\varepsilon^{\overline{a}}|\log\varepsilon|^{\overline{b}},$$

with $\delta(\varepsilon)$ the same as above and $A \geq 1$ to be selected, we notice that, for large enough A,

$$\lambda(\varepsilon)\geq c\left(A\delta(\varepsilon)^{\overline{a}}\left|\log\delta(\varepsilon)\right|^{\overline{b}}\right)^{1/(1-2\overline{a})} = cA^{1/(1-2\overline{a})}\delta(\varepsilon)^{\alpha}\left|\log\delta(\varepsilon)\right|^{\beta}\geq A\delta(\varepsilon)^{\alpha}\left|\log\delta(\varepsilon)\right|^{\beta},$$

where α and β are as defined in (2.22). We proceed similarly as above, using (6.7) to obtain

$$\begin{aligned}
&\bigcap_{\eta>0}\bigcup_{0<\varepsilon\leq\eta}\left\{\omega\in\Omega\,:\,\sup_{x\in B_T}\sup_{0<t\leq T}\left(u^\varepsilon(x,t,\omega)-u(x,t)\right)\geq C_{22}T\lambda(\varepsilon)\right\}\\
&\qquad\subseteq\bigcap_{\eta>0}\bigcup_{0<\varepsilon\leq\eta}\left\{\omega\in\Omega\,:\,\inf_{|y|\leq C_{22}\delta(\varepsilon)\lambda(\varepsilon)T^2/\varepsilon^2}\ \inf_{|p|\leq L}\left(-\delta(\varepsilon)v^{\delta(\varepsilon)}(y,\omega\,;p)-\overline{H}(p)\right)\leq -\lambda(\varepsilon)\right\}\\
&\qquad\subseteq\bigcap_{\eta>0}\bigcup_{0<\varepsilon\leq\eta}\left\{\omega\in\Omega\,:\,\inf_{|y|\leq CT/\varepsilon\lambda(\varepsilon)}\ \inf_{|p|\leq L}\left(-\delta(\varepsilon)v^{\delta(\varepsilon)}(y,\omega\,;p)-\overline{H}(p)\right)\leq -A\delta(\varepsilon)^{\alpha}\left|\log\delta(\varepsilon)\right|^{\beta}\right\}.
\end{aligned}$$

According to (5.40), the last set on the right has probability zero provided $A \geq 1$ is chosen sufficiently large. It follows that

$$\mathbb{P}\left[\limsup_{\varepsilon\to 0}\sup_{x\in B_T}\sup_{0<t\leq T}\frac{u^\varepsilon(x,t,\cdot)-u(x,t)}{\lambda(\varepsilon)} \leq T\right] = 1,$$

which completes the proof of (ii). $\square$

7. Convergence rates in almost periodic environments

We conclude by showing that the techniques in the previous section may be used to obtain convergence rate for the homogenization of (1.1) in almost periodic (and in particular periodic) media. Since it is necessary to reproduce the qualitative homogenization theory from scratch, we take the opportunity to efficiently reorganize and quantify the argument.

Departing from the hypotheses in the rest of this paper, here we consider $H \in C(\mathbb{R}^d \times \mathbb{R}^d)$ satisfying, for each $K > 0$, the regularity assumption

$$H \text{ is uniformly continuous on } B_K \times \mathbb{R}^d \text{ and } \left\{ H(\cdot, y) \, : \, y \in \mathbb{R}^d \right\} \text{ is bounded in } C^{0,1}(B_K) \tag{7.1}$$

and the coercivity condition

$$\lim_{|p|\to\infty}\inf_{y\in\mathbb{R}^d} H(p,y) = +\infty. \tag{7.2}$$

The assumption of almost periodicity is that the family of translations of H in the y-variable is precompact in the uniform topology of $B_K \times \mathbb{R}^d$. Precisely, we assume that, for all $K > 0$,

$$\left\{ H(\cdot, \cdot + y) \, : \, y \in \mathbb{R}^d \right\} \quad \text{is precompact in } C(B_K \times \mathbb{R}^d). \tag{7.3}$$

We remark that, in this section, we make no convexity assumption on H, nor do we assume any analogue of (2.9) or (2.11).

The homogenization of coercive Hamilton-Jacobi equations in almost periodic environments was proved in [17]. The key observation was an elegant proof of the following fact.

Proposition 7.1 (Ishii [17]). *Assume that $H \in C(\mathbb{R}^d \times \mathbb{R}^d)$ satisfies (7.1), (7.2) and (7.3). Then there exists $\overline{H} \in C(\mathbb{R}^d)$ such that, for every $p \in \mathbb{R}^d$,*

$$\lim_{\delta\to 0}\sup_{y\in\mathbb{R}^d}\left|\delta v^\delta(y\,;p) + \overline{H}(p)\right| = 0. \tag{7.4}$$

The rate of convergence in almost periodic environments follows from Lemma 6.1 once a rate for the limit (7.4) is obtained. For the latter, it is necessary to quantify the almost periodicity of H, which leads us to introduce, for each $K > 0$ and $R > 0$,

$$\rho_K(R) := \sup_{y\in\mathbb{R}^d}\inf_{z\in B_R}\sup_{(p,x)\in B_K\times\mathbb{R}^d}\left|H(p,x+y) - H(p,x+z)\right|.$$

It is immediate from (7.1) that, for each $K > 0$, ρ_K is continuous and we see from its definition that it is decreasing. The assumption (7.3) is equivalent to the statement that, for each $K > 0$,

$$\lim_{R\to\infty}\rho_K(R) = 0.$$

We next define, for each $K > 0$ and $0 < \delta < 1$,

$$\eta_K(\delta) := 4\inf\left\{ s > 0 \, : \, \rho_K\left(\frac{s}{K\delta}\right) \leq s \right\}. \tag{7.5}$$

The properties of ρ_K yield that η_K is a modulus, i.e., for each $K>0$,

$$\eta_K : (0,1) \to [0,\infty) \quad \text{is continuous, increasing and } \lim_{\delta\to 0} \eta_K(\delta) = 0. \tag{7.6}$$

Observe that if $y \mapsto H(p,y)$ is 1-periodic, then $\rho_K\left(\frac{1}{2}\right) = 0$ for all $K>0$ and, hence, $\eta_K(\delta) \le \frac{1}{2}\delta$.

We also define, for each $K>0$, the quantity

$$L = L(K) := \sup\left\{ |q| \, : \, \inf_{y\in\mathbb{R}^d} H(q,y) \le \sup_{(p,y)\in B_R\times\mathbb{R}^d} H(p,y) \right\}, \tag{7.7}$$

which has the property (this is not difficult to check using similar arguments as in Appendix B) that, for every $p\in\mathbb{R}^d$,

$$|Dv^\delta(\cdot\,;p)| \le L(|p|). \tag{7.8}$$

We prove next a quantitative version of Proposition 7.1. The argument is inspired from [21, 17]. Here we simply reorganize and quantify it.

Proposition 7.2. *Assume that $H\in C(\mathbb{R}^d\times\mathbb{R}^d)$ satisfies* (7.1), (7.2) *and* (7.3). *Then there exists $\overline{H}\in C(\mathbb{R}^d)$ such that, for every $K>0$, $\delta,\gamma\in(0,1]$ and $p\in B_K$,*

$$\sup_{y\mathbb{R}^d} \left| \delta v^\delta(y\,;p) + \overline{H}(p) \right| \le \eta_L(\delta), \tag{7.9}$$

where $L=L(K)$ is given by (7.7).

Proof. The result follows from two facts. The first is that, for every $\delta>0$,

$$\operatorname*{osc}_{\mathbb{R}^d} \delta v^\delta(\cdot\,;p) \le \eta_L(\delta), \tag{7.10}$$

and the second is that, for every $\delta,\gamma\in(0,1]$,

$$\inf_{\mathbb{R}^d} \gamma v^\gamma(\cdot\,;p) \le \sup_{\mathbb{R}^d} \delta v^\delta(\cdot\,;p). \tag{7.11}$$

To demonstrate (7.10) we fix $\widehat{y}\in\mathbb{R}^d$. Let $R>0$ be selected below, and choose $z\in\overline{B}_R$ such that

$$\sup_{(q,y)\in B_L\times\mathbb{R}^d} |H(q,y+\widehat{y}) - H(q,y+z)| \le \rho_L(R). \tag{7.12}$$

It follows from Proposition B.1, by comparing $v^\delta(\cdot+\widehat{y}\,;p)$ to $v^\delta(\cdot+z\,;p)\pm\rho_L(R)/\delta$, that

$$\sup_{y\in\mathbb{R}^d} \left| \delta v^\delta(y+\widehat{y}\,;p) - \delta v^\delta(y+z\,;p) \right| \le \rho_L(R).$$

In particular, and in view of (7.8), we have

$$\sup_{y\in\mathbb{R}^d} \left| \delta v^\delta(\widehat{y}\,;p) - \delta v^\delta(0\,;p) \right| \le \rho_L(R) + \delta L|z| \le \rho_L(R) + \delta L R.$$

Optimizing over R leads to the choice $R := \eta_L(\delta)/4\delta L$, which yields, in light of (7.5),

$$\left| \delta v^\delta(\widehat{y}\,;p) - \delta v^\delta(0\,;p) \right| \le \frac{1}{2}\eta_L(\delta).$$

Since $\widehat{y}\in\mathbb{R}^d$ was arbitrary, we obtain (7.10).

The proof of (7.11) is easy and comes from [21]. Suppose, for some $\delta,\gamma\in(0,1]$, that (7.11) is false. For $0<\alpha\le 1$ to be selected, consider the function

$$w(y) := v^\delta(y\,;p) - \alpha\left(1+|y|^2\right)^{\frac{1}{2}}.$$

Using (7.1), we see that, if $\alpha > 0$ is chosen suitable small, then

$$H(p + Dw, y) \le -\sup_{\mathbb{R}^d} \delta v^\delta(\cdot\,; p) + C\alpha < -\inf_{\mathbb{R}^d} \gamma v^\gamma(\cdot\,; p) \le H(p + Dv^\gamma, y) \quad \text{in } \mathbb{R}^d.$$

The comparison principle (Proposition 3.4), (5.2) and (7.1) imply that, for every $R > 0$,

$$w(0) - v^\gamma(0) \le \max_{\partial B_R}(w - v^\gamma) \le C\left(\frac{1}{\gamma} + \frac{1}{\delta}\right) - \alpha R.$$

Send $R \to +\infty$ to obtain the desired contradiction.

It is immediate from (7.10) and (7.11) that, if we define

$$\overline{H}(p) := \liminf_{\delta \to 0} -\delta v^\delta(0\,; p),$$

then (7.9) holds. The continuity of $\overline{H}$ is immediate from Proposition B.9. ☐

The combination of Proposition 7.2 and Lemma 6.1 yields the following convergence rate for the homogenization of (1.1) in almost periodic media. In order to apply Lemma 6.1, we note that its proof did not depend in any way on the random environment or the structural assumptions, such as level-set convexity or (2.9), which are not in force in this section.

Proposition 7.3. *Assume that $H \in C(\mathbb{R}^d \times \mathbb{R}^d)$ satisfies* (7.1)*,* (7.2) *and* (7.3)*. Consider the unique solutions $u^\varepsilon, u \in C^{0,1}(\mathbb{R}^d \times [0,T])$ of*

$$u_t^\varepsilon + H\left(Du^\varepsilon, \frac{x}{\varepsilon}\right) = 0 \quad \text{and} \quad u_t + \overline{H}(Du) = 0 \quad \text{in } \mathbb{R}^d \times (0,T)$$

subject to the initial condition $u^\varepsilon(0,t) = u(0,t) = u_0(x) \in C^{0,1}(\mathbb{R}^d)$, and let $K > 0$ be such that

$$|u^\varepsilon(x,t) - u^\varepsilon(y,s)| \vee |u(x,t) - u(y,s)| \le K(|x-y| + |t-s|)\,.$$

Then there exists a constant $C_{23} > 0$ such that, for all $T \ge 1$ and $\varepsilon > 0$,

$$\sup_{(x,t)\in\mathbb{R}^d\times[0,T]} |u^\varepsilon(x,t) - u(x,t)| \le C_{23} T\left(\varepsilon^{\frac{1}{3}} + \eta_L\big(\varepsilon^{\frac{1}{3}}\big)\right), \tag{7.13}$$

where $L = L(K)$ is given by (7.7) *and the modulus $\eta_L(\cdot)$ by* (7.5)*.*

Proof. For $\varepsilon, \alpha > 0$, we define $\delta(\varepsilon) := \varepsilon^{\frac{1}{3}}$ and

$$\lambda(\varepsilon,\alpha) := \left((C_{22}/T)^{\frac{1}{2}}\delta(\varepsilon)\right) \vee \eta_L(\delta) + \alpha$$

and observe that (6.5) holds for $\alpha, \varepsilon > 0$ small enough. An application of Lemma 6.1 yields

$$\sup_{(x,t)\in\mathbb{R}^d\times[0,T]} |u^\varepsilon(x,t) - u(x,t)| \le C_{22} T \lambda(\varepsilon,\alpha).$$

Let $\alpha \to 0$ to get (7.13). ☐

Observe that for a periodic Hamiltonian satisfying (7.1) and (7.2), Proposition 7.3 gives a rate of convergence of $O\big(\varepsilon^{\frac{1}{3}}\big)$ for homogenization.

Appendix A. The metric problem: basic properties

We summarize some elementary facts concerning solution of the eikonal-type equation

$$H(Du, y, \omega) = \mu, \tag{A.1}$$

in exterior domains, with $\mu > \overline{H}_*$, where $\overline{H}_*$ is a critical parameter. Most of what follows is well-known and can be found for example in [20] or [4], but we briefly sketch the arguments for the convenience of the reader. Throughout this section, we assume that H satisfies (2.10).

The critical parameter $\overline{H}_*$ is the infimum of all μ for which (A.1) admits a global subsolution. It turns out (see [4]) that $\overline{H}_* = \min \overline{H}$ and the assumption (2.9) implies that $\overline{H}_* = \overline{H}(0) = 0$.

We begin with a comparison principle, which makes minimal assumptions on the growth of the subsolution and supersolution at infinity.

Proposition A.1 ([4, Proposition 3.1]). *Let $\mu > 0$, $K \subseteq \mathbb{R}^d$ be compact and $u, -v \in \mathrm{USC}(\mathbb{R}^d \setminus K)$ satisfy*

$$H(Du, y, \omega) \leq \mu \leq H(Dv, y, \omega) \quad \text{in } \mathbb{R}^d \setminus K \quad \text{and} \quad \limsup_{y \to K} (u(y) - v(y)) \leq 0 \tag{A.2}$$

and

$$\liminf_{|y| \to \infty} \frac{v(y)}{|y|} \geq 0.$$

Then $u \leq v$ in $\mathbb{R}^d \setminus K$.

Next we define, for each $x, y \in \mathbb{R}^d$, $\mu \geq 0$, and $\omega \in \Omega$,

$$m_\mu(z, x, \omega) := \sup \left\{ w(z) - w(x) \, : \, w \in \mathcal{L} \text{ and } H(Dw, y, \omega) \leq \mu \text{ in } \mathbb{R}^d \right\}. \tag{A.3}$$

Note that, due to (2.9), the zero function belongs to the admissible class, which is therefore nonempty. Lemma (3.5) and (2.6) yield that $m_\mu(y, x, \omega)$ is finite and, in fact, nonnegative and bounded from above by $C|y - x|$, for some $C > 0$ depending on an upper bound for μ.

It is immediate from (A.3) that m_μ is measurable with respect to $\mathcal{B} \otimes \mathcal{B} \otimes \mathcal{F}$, since the expression on the right of (A.3) is. Moreover, from (A.3) and (2.2) we see that m_μ is jointly stationary in its first two variables, i.e., for every $x, y, z \in \mathbb{R}^d$ and $\omega \in \Omega$,

$$m_\mu(y, x, \tau_z \omega) = m_\mu(y + z, x + z, \omega). \tag{A.4}$$

Also immediate from (A.3) (and the fact that a supremum of a family of viscosity subsolutions is a viscosity subsolution, see [9, 6]) that the $m_\mu(\cdot, x, \omega)$'s are global subsolutions of (A.1), i.e., for every $\mu \geq 0$, $x \in \mathbb{R}^d$ and $\omega \in \Omega$,

$$H(Dm_\mu(\cdot, x, \omega), y, \omega) \leq \mu \quad \text{in } \mathbb{R}^d. \tag{A.5}$$

Further properties of the m_μ's are recorded in the next proposition. Since detailed proofs of most of these facts can be found in [4], here we present only brief sketches of the arguments.

Proposition A.2. *For every $\mu \geq 0$ and $\omega \in \Omega$, the following hold:*

(i) *For each fixed $x \in \mathbb{R}$, the function $m_\mu(\cdot, x, \omega)$ is a solution of*

$$H(Dm_\mu(\cdot, x, \omega), y, \omega) = \mu \quad \text{in } \mathbb{R}^d \setminus \{x\} \quad \text{and} \quad m_\mu(x, x, \omega) = 0. \tag{A.6}$$

Moreover, if $\mu > 0$, then m_μ is the unique nonnegative solution of (A.6).

(ii) *If $U \subseteq \mathbb{R}^d$ is open, $x \in \mathbb{R}^d \setminus U$ and $u \in \mathcal{L}$ is a subsolution of* (A.1) *in U, then*

$$u - m_\mu(\cdot, x, \omega) \le \max_{y \in \partial U} \left(u(y) - m_\mu(y, x, \omega)\right) \quad \text{in } U. \tag{A.7}$$

(iii) *For $x, y, z \in \mathbb{R}^d$,*

$$m_\mu(y, x, \omega) \le m_\mu(y, z, \omega) + m_\mu(z, x, \omega). \tag{A.8}$$

(iv) *There exist $l_\mu, L_\mu \ge 0$ satisfying, for some $C, c > 0$ depending only on an upper bound for μ,*

$$c\mu \le l_\mu \le L_\mu \le C, \tag{A.9}$$

such that

$$l_\mu |y - x| \le m_\mu(y, x, \omega) \le L_\mu |y - x|. \tag{A.10}$$

(v) *For every $x, y \in \mathbb{R}^d$,*

$$|m_\mu(y, x, \omega) - m_\mu(z, x, \omega)| \le L_\mu |y - z|. \tag{A.11}$$

(vi) *For every open set $U \subseteq \mathbb{R}^d$, $x \in U$ and $y \in \mathbb{R}^d \setminus U$,*

$$m_\mu(y, x, \omega) = \min_{z \in \partial U} \big(m_\mu(y, z, \omega) + m_\mu(z, x, \omega)\big). \tag{A.12}$$

(vii) *For every $x \in \mathbb{R}^d$,*

$$H(-Dm_\mu(x, \cdot, \omega), y, \omega) = \mu \quad \text{in } \mathbb{R}^d \setminus \{x\} \tag{A.13}$$

and

$$H(-Dm_\mu(x, \cdot, \omega), y, \omega) \le \mu \quad \text{in } \mathbb{R}^d. \tag{A.14}$$

(viii) *There exists a constant $c > 0$, depending on an upper bound for μ, such that, for every $0 \le \widehat{\mu} \le \mu$ and $x, y \in \mathbb{R}^d$,*

$$m_{\widehat{\mu}}(y, x, \omega) + c(\mu - \widehat{\mu})|x - y| \le m_\mu(y, x, \omega). \tag{A.15}$$

Proof. (i) Perron's method yields that $m_\mu(\cdot, x, \omega)$ is a solution of (A.6) in $\mathbb{R}^d \setminus \{x\}$. Recall from (A.5) that it is also a subsolution in $\mathbb{R}^d$. The uniqueness for $\mu > 0$ follows from Proposition A.1.

(ii) Assume that (A.7) fails and, by adding a constant to u, that the right side of (A.7) is negative while the left side is positive at some point $y_0 \in U$. Define

$$v(y) := \begin{cases} m_\mu(y, x, \omega) & \text{if } y \in \mathbb{R}^d \setminus U, \\ u(y) \vee m_\mu(y, x, \omega) & \text{if } y \in U, \end{cases}$$

and observe that $v(x) = 0$, $m_\mu(\cdot, x, \omega) \le v$ in $\mathbb{R}^d$ and $m_\mu(y_0, x, \omega) < v(y_0)$. Moreover, it is clear from its definition that v is a subsolution of (A.1) in $\mathbb{R}^d$. This contradicts (A.3).

(iii) follows from (ii). Indeed, observe that, according to Lemma 3.5, as a function of y, the left side of (A.8) is a subsolution of (A.1) in $\mathbb{R}^d$ and is equal to the right side of (3.5) at $y = z$. The maximality of $m_\mu(\cdot, z, \omega)$ (i.e., property (ii) with $U = \mathbb{R}^d \setminus \{x\}$) then implies (A.8).

(iv) The lower bound of (A.10) follows from the observation that, if $\mu \le K$, then (2.5) and (2.9) imply the existence of some $c > 0$, depending on K, such that, for every $x \in \mathbb{R}^d$, the function $y \mapsto c\mu|y - x|$ is a subsolution of (A.1) in $\mathbb{R}^d$. The upper bound is immediate from Proposition (A.1) and the fact that, for large enough $C > 0$ and any $x \in \mathbb{R}^d$, the map $y \mapsto C|y - x|$ is a supersolution in $\mathbb{R}^d \setminus \{x\}$.

(v) The Lipschitz estimate (A.11) is immediate from (A.8) and (A.10).

(vi) One direction of (A.12) is obvious from (A.8) and holds without restriction on $x, y \in \mathbb{R}^d$ and $\omega \in \Omega$. For the other, we first assume that U is bounded and note that, due to Lemma 3.5,

$$\phi(y) := \min_{z \in \partial U} \left(m_\mu(y, z, \omega) + m_\mu(z, x, \omega) \right)$$

is a solution of $H(D\phi, y, \omega) \leq \mu$ in $\mathbb{R}^d \setminus \overline{U}$. For $y \in \partial U$ we may take $z = y$ in the minimum to obtain $\phi(y) \leq m_\mu(y, x, \omega)$. The maximality of $m_\mu(\cdot, x, \omega)$ yields $\phi \leq m_\mu(\cdot, x, \omega)$ in $\mathbb{R}^d \setminus U$, which is the other side of (A.12). If U is not bounded, then we approximate U by bounded sets and use (A.10), which implies that points $z \in \partial U$ which are very far away from x and y are irrelevant.

(vii) follows from Lemma 3.5 and (A.3). Indeed, it is immediate from the definitions that $m_\mu(y, x, \omega) = n_\mu(x, y, \omega)$, where n_μ is the function corresponding to m_μ for the Hamiltonian $H(-p, y, \omega)$. Thus (A.13) holds and we can apply Lemma 3.5 to obtain (A.14).

(viii) follows from (2.5) and (ii). We observe that, as a function of y, the left side of (A.15) is a subsolution of (A.1), provided that we take $c > 0$ small enough. Both sides of (A.15) vanish at $y = x$, and so the result follows from the maximality of $m_\mu(\cdot, x, \omega)$. □

Remark A.3. The functions m_μ can be expressed by the following representation formula due to Lions [20], which provides the above facts with a control theoretic interpretation:

$$m_\mu(y, x, \omega) = \inf \left\{ \int_0^1 J_\mu(\gamma'(s), \gamma(s), \omega)\, ds \;:\; \gamma \in \mathcal{C}(x, y) \right\}, \tag{A.16}$$

where $\mathcal{C}(x, y)$ is the set of Lipschitz curves $\gamma : [0, 1] \to \mathbb{R}^d$ such that $\gamma(0) = x$ and $\gamma(1) = y$ and J_μ is the support function of the μ-sublevel set of H, given by

$$J_\mu(q, y, \omega) := \sup \left\{ p \cdot q \;:\; H(p, y, \omega) \leq \mu \right\}.$$

The expression (A.16) provides us with an interpretation of $m_\mu(y, x, \omega)$ as measuring the "cost" of moving from the point x to the point y in the medium ω. We make no direct use of (A.16) in this paper, preferring instead to work with the maximality property (Proposition A.2(ii)) which is equivalent to it. Nevertheless, our intuition is enriched from (A.16) and it suggests an analogy between the metric problem and first-passage percolation.

Definition A.4. For each $\mu, t > 0$ and $x \in \mathbb{R}^d$, we define the *reachable set to x in time t* by

$$\mathcal{R}_{\mu,t}(x) := \left\{ (y, \omega) \in \mathbb{R}^d \times \Omega : m_\mu(y, x, \omega) \leq t \right\}. \tag{A.17}$$

We also use the notation $\mathcal{R}_{\mu,t} = \mathcal{R}_{\mu,t}(0)$, $\mathcal{R}^\omega_{\mu,t}(x) := \{ y \in \mathbb{R}^d : (y, \omega) \in \mathcal{R}_{\mu,t}(x) \}$ and $\mathcal{R}^\omega_{\mu,t} = \mathcal{R}^\omega_{\mu,t}(0)$.

We continue by examining some elementary properties of the reachable set. According to (A.10), we have $m_\mu(y, x, \omega) < t$ for y in the interior of $\mathcal{R}^\omega_{\mu,t}(x)$ and, for all $\mu, t > 0$ and $\omega \in \Omega$,

$$B_{t/L_\mu} \subseteq \mathcal{R}^\omega_{\mu,t} \subseteq B_{t/l_\mu}. \tag{A.18}$$

In fact, from (A.10) and (A.20), we have the following improvement of (A.18), which estimates the rate of growth of the reachable set: for every $0 < s < t$ and $\omega \in \Omega$,

$$\left\{ x \in \mathbb{R}^d \;:\; \operatorname{dist}\left(x, \mathcal{R}^\omega_{\mu,s}\right) \leq L_\mu^{-1}(t - s) \right\} \subseteq \mathcal{R}^\omega_{\mu,t} \subseteq \left\{ x \in \mathbb{R}^d \;:\; \operatorname{dist}\left(x, \mathcal{R}^\omega_{\mu,s}\right) \leq l_\mu^{-1}(t - s) \right\}. \tag{A.19}$$

It is useful to note that, in the particular case that $x = 0$ and $U = \mathcal{R}^\omega_{\mu,t}$, Proposition A.2(vi) asserts that, for every $t > 0$ and $y \notin \mathcal{R}^\omega_{\mu,t}$,

$$m_\mu(y, 0, \omega) = t + \min_{z \in \mathcal{R}^\omega_{\mu,t}} m_\mu(y, z, \omega). \tag{A.20}$$

It also follows from (A.12) that, for every $s, t > 0$ and $y \in \mathbb{R}^d$,

$$m_\mu(y, \mathcal{R}^\omega_{\mu,t}, \omega) - m_\mu(y, \mathcal{R}^\omega_{\mu,s}, \omega) \leq |s - t|. \tag{A.21}$$

The maximality property (Proposition A.2(ii)) can be improved for the domain $U = \mathcal{R}^\omega_{\mu,t}(x) \setminus \{x\}$ by restricting the maximum over ∂U to $\{x\}$, as stated in the following lemma. This is the crucial fact that localizes the metric problem.

Lemma A.5. *For every* $\omega \in \Omega$, $\mu \geq 0$, $x \in \mathbb{R}^d$ *and* $w \in \operatorname{Lip}(\mathcal{R}^\omega_{\mu,t}(x))$,

$$H(Dw, y, \omega) \leq \mu \quad \text{in } \mathcal{R}^\omega_{\mu,t}(x) \qquad \text{implies} \qquad w(\cdot) - w(x) \leq m_\mu(\cdot, x, \omega) \quad \text{in } \mathcal{R}^\omega_{\mu,t}(x). \tag{A.22}$$

Proof. Let $w \in \operatorname{Lip}(\mathcal{R}^\omega_{\mu,t}(\omega))$ satisfy the antecedent of (A.22) and assume with no loss of generality that $w(x) = 0$. Define $\widetilde{w} := m_\mu(\cdot, x, \omega) \vee (w(\cdot) \wedge (t - \varepsilon))$ and observe that, in light of Lemma 3.5 and (2.9), $\widetilde{w}$ is a subsolution of $H(D\widetilde{w}, y, \omega) \leq \mu$ in $\mathbb{R}^d$. We deduce from the maximality property that $\widetilde{w} \leq m_\mu(\cdot, x, \omega)$ in $\mathbb{R}^d$ and in particular $w \wedge (t - \varepsilon) \leq m_\mu(\cdot, x, \omega)$ in $\mathcal{R}^\omega_{\mu,t}(x)$. Sending $\varepsilon \to 0$ and using that $m_\mu(y, x, \omega) < t$ in the interior of $\mathcal{R}^\omega_{\mu,t}(x)$, we obtain that $w \leq m_\mu(\cdot, x, \omega)$ in $\mathcal{R}^\omega_{\mu,t}(x)$, as claimed. □

It follows from Lemma A.5 that the representation formula (A.3) may be restricted to the reachable set. Precisely, for every $\omega \in \Omega$, $\mu \geq 0$, $x \in \mathbb{R}^d$ and $y \in \mathcal{R}^\omega_{\mu,t}(x)$,

$$m_\mu(y, x, \omega) = \sup\left\{ w(y) - w(x) \,:\, w \in \operatorname{Lip}(\mathcal{R}^\omega_{\mu,t}(x)) \ \text{ and } \ H(Dw, y, \omega) \leq \mu \text{ in } \mathcal{R}^\omega_{\mu,t}(x) \right\}. \tag{A.23}$$

This is immediate from (A.22).

In the proof of Lemma 3.1, we require a refinement of Lemma A.5. To this state this, we define, for every nonempty closed set $K \subseteq \mathbb{R}^d$, $x, y \in K$ and $\omega \in \Omega$,

$$m^K_\mu(y, x, \omega) := \sup\left\{ w(y) - w(x) \,:\, w \in \operatorname{Lip}(K) \ \text{ and } \ H(Dw, y, \omega) \leq \mu \text{ in } K \right\}. \tag{A.24}$$

It is immediate that m^K_μ is $\mathcal{G}(K)$-measurable, and

$$K_1 \subseteq K_2 \qquad \text{implies that} \qquad m^{K_1}_\mu(y, x, \omega) \geq m^{K_2}_\mu(y, x, \omega) \ \text{ for all } \ x, y \in K_1. \tag{A.25}$$

Thus (A.23) yields that

$$R^\omega_{\mu,t} \subseteq K \subseteq \mathbb{R}^d \qquad \text{implies that} \qquad m_\mu(\cdot, 0, \omega) = m^K_\mu(\cdot, 0, \omega) \quad \text{in } \mathcal{R}^\omega_{\mu,t}. \tag{A.26}$$

In fact, by a similar argument as in the proof of Lemma A.5: if $0 \in K$, then

$$\inf_{y \in \partial K} m^K_\mu(y, 0, \omega) \geq t \quad \text{implies that} \quad m^K_\mu(\cdot, 0, \omega) \equiv m_\mu(\cdot, 0, \omega) \quad \text{in } \left\{ m^K_\mu(\cdot, 0, \omega) \leq t \right\}. \tag{A.27}$$

Here is the proof: consider the function $m^K_\mu(\cdot, 0, \omega) \wedge (t - \varepsilon)$ and extend this to $\mathbb{R}^d$ by giving it the value $(t - \varepsilon)$ outside of K. This is a global subsolution by Lemma 3.5 and the assumption that $m^K_\mu(\cdot, 0, \omega) \geq t$ on ∂K. Thus by the maximality of m_μ we deduce $m_\mu \geq m^K_\mu(\cdot, 0, \omega) \wedge (t - \varepsilon)$. Sending $\varepsilon \to 0$ yields $m_\mu(\cdot, 0, \omega) \geq m^K_\mu(\cdot, 0, \omega)$ in $\left\{ m^K_\mu(\cdot, 0, \omega) \leq t \right\}$. In light of (A.25), this completes the proof of (A.27), which is needed in the proof of (3.7).

For $\mu > 0$, we define the filtration $\{\mathcal{F}_{\mu,t}\}_{t \geq 0}$ by

$$\mathcal{F}_{\mu,0} = \{\varnothing, \Omega\} \qquad \text{and} \qquad \mathcal{F}_{\mu,t} := \mathcal{G}(\mathcal{R}_{\mu,t}) \ \text{ for } \ t > 0,$$

where $\mathcal{G}$ is as defined in Section 2. Intuitively, the σ-field $\mathcal{F}_{\mu,t}$ consists of the information uncovered by observing the Hamiltonian $H(p, x, \omega)$ for $x \in \mathcal{R}_{\mu,t}(\omega)$ and $p \in \mathbb{R}^d$.

It is immediate from (A.23) that, for every $y \in \mathbb{R}^d$,

$$\omega \mapsto m_\mu(y, 0, \omega) \mathbb{1}_{\{y \in \mathcal{R}_{\mu,t}\}}(\omega) \quad \text{is } \mathcal{F}_{\mu,t}\text{-measurable}. \tag{A.28}$$

According to (A.18) and (A.28), for every $y \in \mathbb{R}^d$ and $t \geq L_\mu |y|$,

$$\omega \mapsto m_\mu(y, 0, \omega) \quad \text{is } \mathcal{F}_{\mu,t}\text{-measurable.} \tag{A.29}$$

We next define, for every compact set K of $\mathbb{R}^d$, $y \in \mathbb{R}^d$ and $\omega \in \Omega$,

$$m_\mu(y, K, \omega) := \inf_{z \in K} m_\mu(y, z, \omega) \qquad \text{and} \qquad m_\mu(K, y, \omega) := \inf_{z \in K} m_\mu(z, y, \omega). \tag{A.30}$$

Proposition A.6. *The functions defined in* (A.30) *are the unique nonnegative solutions of*

$$H(Dm_\mu(\cdot, K, \omega), y, \omega) = \mu \quad \textit{and} \quad H(-Dm_\mu(K, \cdot, \omega), y, \omega) = \mu \quad \textit{in } \mathbb{R}^d \setminus K \tag{A.31}$$

which satisfy the boundary condition $m_\mu(\cdot, K, \omega) = m_\mu(K, \cdot, \omega) = 0$ *on* ∂K*. Moreover, they are also given by the representation formulas*

$$m_\mu(y, K, \omega) = \min_{x \in K} \sup \Big\{ w(z) - w(x) \,:\, w \in \mathcal{L},\ H(Dw, z, \omega) \leq \mu \ \textit{in } \mathbb{R}^d \setminus K \Big\}, \tag{A.32}$$

and

$$m_\mu(K, z, \omega) = \min_{x \in K} \sup \Big\{ w(x) - w(z) \,:\, w \in \mathcal{L},\ H(Dw, y, \omega) \leq \mu \ \textit{in } \mathbb{R}^d \setminus K \Big\}. \tag{A.33}$$

Proof. That $m_\mu(\cdot, K, \omega)$ and $m_\mu(K, \cdot, \omega)$ satisfy (A.31) is immediate from (A.6) and (A.13) and the fact that, in light of Lemma 3.5, the infimum of a family of solutions is a solution. Uniqueness follows from Proposition A.1.

It is easy to check from the standard Perron argument, using again the fact that a minimum of solutions is a solution, that the right side of (A.32), as a function of z, is a solution of the first equation in (A.31). Clearly it vanishes on K by taking $x = z$ in the minimum and the zero function in the supremum. Therefore it must equal $m_\mu(\cdot, K, \omega)$ by the uniqueness of the latter. This proves (A.32), and (A.33) is obtained similarly. □

It is immediate from (A.32) and (A.33) that, for every compact $K \in \mathbb{R}^d$ and $y \in \mathbb{R}^d$,

$$\omega \mapsto m_\mu(y, K, \omega) \quad \text{and} \quad \omega \mapsto m_\mu(K, y, \omega) \quad \text{are } \ \mathcal{G}\left(\mathbb{R}^d \backslash K\right)\text{-measurable.} \tag{A.34}$$

The connection between the metric problem and $\overline{H}$ is provided by the equivalence

$$\mu \geq \overline{H}(p) \quad \text{if and only if} \quad \liminf_{|y| \to \infty} |y|^{-1} \left(m_\mu(y, 0, \omega) - p \cdot y \right) \geq 0 \ \text{ a.s. in } \omega. \tag{A.35}$$

This fact is at the heart of the qualitative homogenization theory. See [4] for a proof. Using (A.8) and the subadditive ergodic theorem, we can find a positively homogeneous and convex function $\overline{m}_\mu \in C(\mathbb{R}^d)$ such that, for every $y, z \in \mathbb{R}^d$ and ω belonging to some fixed event of full probability,

$$\lim_{t \to \infty} \frac{1}{t} \left| m_\mu(ty, tz, \omega) - \overline{m}_\mu(y - z) \right| = 0. \tag{A.36}$$

For the details of the argument, we refer to [3, 4]. It follows from (A.8) and (A.36) that $\overline{m}_\mu$ is convex and positively homogeneous. From (A.35) we deduce that (c.f. [4])

$$\overline{H}(D\overline{m}_\mu) = \mu \quad \text{in } \mathbb{R}^d \setminus \{0\}. \tag{A.37}$$

The functions $\overline{m}_\mu$ prescribe the effective Hamiltonian $\overline{H}(p)$ via the formula

$$\overline{H}(p) := \inf \Big\{ \mu \geq 0 \,:\, \overline{m}_\mu(y) \geq p \cdot y \ \text{ for all } \ y \in \mathbb{R}^d \Big\}, \tag{A.38}$$

a fact which follows easily from (A.35) and (A.36) and is essentially equivalent to (A.37). We deduce from (A.37) that $\overline{H}$ is level-set convex. Moreover, it is a consequence of (2.7) and (2.8) that, for every $\mu > 0$, the level set $\{p \in \mathbb{R}^d : \overline{H}(p) = \mu\}$ has empty interior. Of course, the minimal level set of $\overline{H}$ may indeed have nonempty interior.

Finally, from elementary convex geometric considerations (see [4] once again) we deduce that, for every $p \notin \operatorname{int}\{q : \overline{H}(q) = 0\}$, we can find a direction e so that the plane with slope p touches m_μ from below at w. Precisely, setting $\mu := \overline{H}(p)$, there exists $e \in \mathbb{R}^d$ with $|e| = 1$ such that

$$\overline{m}_\mu(e) - p \cdot e = 0 = \min_{y \in \mathbb{R}^d} \left(\overline{m}_\mu(y) - p \cdot y \right). \tag{A.39}$$

Appendix B. The approximate cell problem: basic properties

We summarize the properties of the *approximate cell problem*

$$\delta v^\delta + H(p + Dv^\delta, y, \omega) = 0 \quad \text{in } \mathbb{R}^d. \tag{B.1}$$

Here $p \in \mathbb{R}^d$ and $\delta > 0$ are given parameters. We note that the results in this section do not make use of assumptions (2.8) or of (2.9), nor do they depend in any way on the random parameter ω, and therefore they hold (with appropriate changes in the notation) for the Hamiltonians encountered in Section 7.

We begin with a comparison principle for (B.1), which can be reduced to Proposition 3.4 by an argument which perturbs the solutions by adding appropriate terms with linear growth (alternatively, a proof can be found in [9, 6]).

Proposition B.1. *Let $\delta > 0$, $p \in \mathbb{R}^d$ and $\omega \in \Omega$. Suppose $u, -v \in \mathrm{USC}(\mathbb{R}^d)$ satisfy*

$$\delta u + H(p + Du, y, \omega) \le 0 \le \delta v + H(p + Dv, y, \omega) \quad \text{in } \mathbb{R}^d, \tag{B.2}$$

and v is bounded below on $\mathbb{R}^d$. Then $u \le v$ in $\mathbb{R}^d$.

For each $\delta > 0$, $p \in \mathbb{R}^d$ and $\omega \in \Omega$, we define

$$v^\delta(y, \omega\,; p) := \sup \Big\{ w(y) \, : \, w \in \mathrm{USC}(\mathbb{R}^d) \text{ satisfies } \delta w + H(p + Dw, y, \omega) \le 0 \text{ in } \mathbb{R}^d \Big\}, \tag{B.3}$$

with the differential inequality interpreted either in the viscosity or in the almost everywhere sense, as these are equivalent by Lemma 3.5. It is clear that the constant function

$$w := -\frac{1}{\delta} \operatorname*{ess\,sup}_{y \in \mathbb{R}^d} H(p, y, \omega) = -\frac{1}{\delta} \operatorname*{ess\,sup}_{\Omega} H(p, 0, \cdot)$$

belongs to the admissible class, hence $v^\delta(\cdot, \omega\,; p) \ge w$. Similarly, the function

$$v := -\frac{1}{\delta} \operatorname*{ess\,inf}_{\Omega} H(p, 0, \cdot)$$

is a bounded supersolution of (B.1), and Proposition B.1 yields $v^\delta(\cdot, \omega\,; p) \le v$. We have shown that, for all $y, p \in \mathbb{R}^d$, $\omega \in \Omega$ and $\delta > 0$,

$$-\operatorname*{ess\,sup}_{\Omega} H(p, 0, \cdot) \le \delta v^\delta(y, \omega\,; p) \le -\operatorname*{ess\,inf}_{\Omega} H(p, 0, \cdot). \tag{B.4}$$

Immediate from (B.3) and (2.2) is that the v^δ's are stationary functions. That is, for all $y, z, p \in \mathbb{R}^d$, $\omega \in \Omega$ and $\delta > 0$,

$$v^\delta(y, \tau_z \omega\,; p) = v^\delta(y + z, \omega\,; p) \tag{B.5}$$

We summarize some further properties of the v^δ's in the following proposition. The proofs, which are standard in the theory of viscosity solutions, are only sketched. For the statements we need to define the constants

$$K_p := \sup\left\{ |p-q| \,:\, \operatorname*{ess\,inf}_{\Omega} H(q,0,\cdot) \leq \operatorname*{ess\,sup}_{\Omega} H(p,0,\cdot) \right\} \tag{B.6}$$

and

$$\Pi_p := \max_{\sigma=\pm 1} \sup_{|q|\leq K_p} \operatorname*{ess\,sup}_{\Omega} \left| H(p+q,0,\cdot) - H(p+(1+\sigma)q,0,\cdot) \right|. \tag{B.7}$$

Note that K_p is finite for $|p|$ bounded by (2.6) and Π_p is also finite for bounded $|p|$ by (2.5).

Proposition B.2. *For every $p\in\mathbb{R}^d$, $\omega\in\Omega$ and $\delta>0$, the following hold:*

(i) *The function $v^\delta(\cdot,\omega\,;p)$ is the unique solution of* (B.1) *belonging to* $\mathrm{BUC}(\mathbb{R}^d)$.

(ii) *For every $x,y\in\mathbb{R}^d$,*

$$\left| v^\delta(x,\omega\,;p) - v^\delta(y,\omega\,;p) \right| \leq K_p|x-y|. \tag{B.8}$$

(iii) *For all $q\in\mathbb{R}^d$,*

$$\left| \delta v^\delta(y,\omega\,;p) - \delta v^\delta(y,\omega\,;q) \right| \leq \sup_{|z|\leq K_p\vee K_q} \operatorname*{ess\,sup}_{\Omega} \left| H(p+z,0,\cdot) - H(q+z,0,\cdot) \right|. \tag{B.9}$$

(iv) *For every $\eta\geq\delta$,*

$$\left| \delta v^\delta(y,\omega\,;p) - \eta v^\eta(y,\omega\,;p) \right| \leq \Pi_p\left(1-\frac{\delta}{\eta}\right). \tag{B.10}$$

Proof. (i) The boundedness of v^δ was proved above in (B.4). That (B.3) gives a solution of (B.1) in $\mathrm{BUC}(\mathbb{R}^d)$ follows from the classical Perron argument adapted to viscosity solutions (see [9]). The uniqueness of v^δ is immediate from Proposition B.1.

(ii) According to (B.4) and Lemma 3.5, $v^\delta(\cdot,\omega\,;p)$ is Lipschitz with a uniform constant that can be estimated by (2.6). We end up with (B.8) with K_p as defined in (B.6).

(iii) The dependence of δv^δ on p can be controlled using the comparison principle together with (2.5) and (B.8). The argument is routine, so we merely sketch it. One inserts $v^\delta(\cdot,\omega\,;q)$ into (B.1), adds or subtracts a constant until the resulting function is a supersolution or subsolution, and applies Propostion B.1. The estimate produced by this argument is (B.8). We remark that, due to (2.5) and (2.6), the right side of (B.9) is controlled by $C|p-q|$ for a constant $C>0$ depending on an upper bound for $|p|\vee|q|$.

(iv) The dependence of δv^δ on δ is also controlled with a simple comparison argument and the help of (2.5) and (B.8). Set $\lambda:=\delta/\eta$ and $w(y):=\lambda v^\delta(y,\omega\,;p)$ and check that

$$\eta w + H(p+Dw,y,\omega) \leq \delta v^\delta + H(p+\lambda Dv^\delta,y,\omega) \leq C(1-\lambda) \quad \text{in } \mathbb{R}^d,$$

where $C=\Pi_p$ defined in (B.7). An application of Proposition B.1 yields

$$\delta v^\delta(\cdot,\omega\,;p) = \eta w \leq \eta v^\eta(\cdot,\omega\,;p) - C(1-\lambda), \tag{B.11}$$

which is half of (B.10). The other inequality is obtained via a similar argument. □

We conclude by recalling that the connection between (B.1) and $\overline{H}$ lies in the limit

$$\sup_{R>0} \limsup_{\delta\to 0} \sup_{y\in B_{R/\delta}} \left| \delta v^\delta(y,\omega\,;p) + \overline{H}(p) \right| = 0, \tag{B.12}$$

which holds for all $p \in \mathbb{R}^d$ and $\omega \in \Omega_0$, where $\Omega_0 \in \mathcal{F}$ is a event of full probability which does not depend on p. This assertion is equivalent to homogenization (see [4] for a proof).

Acknowledgements. The first author was partially supported by NSF Grant DMS-1004645 and the third author by NSF Grant DMS-0901802.

References

[1] K. S. Alexander. A note on some rates of convergence in first-passage percolation. *Ann. Appl. Probab.*, 3(1):81–90, 1993.

[2] N. Alon and J. H. Spencer. *The probabilistic method.* Wiley-Interscience Series in Discrete Mathematics and Optimization. John Wiley & Sons Inc., Hoboken, NJ, third edition, 2008.

[3] S. N. Armstrong and P. E. Souganidis. Stochastic homogenization of Hamilton-Jacobi and degenerate Bellman equations in unbounded environments. *J. Math. Pures Appl.*, 97:460–504, 2012.

[4] S. N. Armstrong and P. E. Souganidis. Stochastic homogenization of level-set convex Hamilton-Jacobi equations. *Int. Math. Res. Not.*, in press. Arxiv:1203.6303 [math.AP].

[5] K. Azuma. Weighted sums of certain dependent random variables. *Tôhoku Math. J. (2)*, 19:357–367, 1967.

[6] G. Barles. *Solutions de viscosité des équations de Hamilton-Jacobi*, volume 17 of *Mathématiques & Applications (Berlin) [Mathematics & Applications]*. Springer-Verlag, Paris, 1994.

[7] I. Benjamini, G. Kalai, and O. Schramm. First passage percolation has sublinear distance variance. *Ann. Probab.*, 31(4):1970–1978, 2003.

[8] I. Capuzzo-Dolcetta and H. Ishii. On the rate of convergence in homogenization of Hamilton-Jacobi equations. *Indiana Univ. Math. J.*, 50(3):1113–1129, 2001.

[9] M. G. Crandall, H. Ishii, and P.-L. Lions. User's guide to viscosity solutions of second order partial differential equations. *Bull. Amer. Math. Soc. (N.S.)*, 27(1):1–67, 1992.

[10] A. Davini and A. Siconolfi. Metric techniques for convex stationary ergodic Hamiltonians. *Calc. Var. Partial Differential Equations*, 40(3-4):391–421, 2011.

[11] A. Davini and A. Siconolfi. Weak KAM Theory topics in the stationary ergodic setting. *Calc. Var. Partial Differential Equations*, in press.

[12] L. C. Evans. The perturbed test function method for viscosity solutions of nonlinear PDE. *Proc. Roy. Soc. Edinburgh Sect. A*, 111(3-4):359–375, 1989.

[13] L. C. Evans. Periodic homogenisation of certain fully nonlinear partial differential equations. *Proc. Roy. Soc. Edinburgh Sect. A*, 120(3-4):245–265, 1992.

[14] B. Grünbaum. *Convex polytopes*, volume 221 of *Graduate Texts in Mathematics.* Springer-Verlag, New York, second edition, 2003. Prepared and with a preface by Volker Kaibel, Victor Klee and Günter M. Ziegler.

[15] J. M. Hammersley. Generalization of the fundamental theorem on sub-additive functions. *Proc. Cambridge Philos. Soc.*, 58:235–238, 1962.

[16] J. M. Hammersley. Postulates for subadditive processes. *Ann. Probability*, 2:652–680, 1974.

[17] H. Ishii. Almost periodic homogenization of Hamilton-Jacobi equations. In *International Conference on Differential Equations, Vol. 1, 2 (Berlin, 1999)*, pages 600–605. World Sci. Publ., River Edge, NJ, 2000.

[18] H. Kesten. On the speed of convergence in first-passage percolation. *Ann. Appl. Probab.*, 3(2):296–338, 1993.

[19] E. Kosygina, F. Rezakhanlou, and S. R. S. Varadhan. Stochastic homogenization of Hamilton-Jacobi-Bellman equations. *Comm. Pure Appl. Math.*, 59(10):1489–1521, 2006.

[20] P.-L. Lions. *Generalized solutions of Hamilton-Jacobi equations*, volume 69 of *Research Notes in Mathematics.* Pitman (Advanced Publishing Program), Boston, Mass., 1982.

[21] P.-L. Lions, G. C. Papanicolaou, and S.R.S. Varadhan. Homogenization of Hamilton-Jacobi equations. Unpublished preprint, 1987.

[22] P.-L. Lions and P. E. Souganidis. Correctors for the homogenization of Hamilton-Jacobi equations in the stationary ergodic setting. *Comm. Pure Appl. Math.*, 56(10):1501–1524, 2003.

[23] P.-L. Lions and P. E. Souganidis. Homogenization of "viscous" Hamilton-Jacobi equations in stationary ergodic media. *Comm. Partial Differential Equations*, 30(1-3):335–375, 2005.

[24] P.-L. Lions and P. E. Souganidis. Stochastic homogenization of Hamilton-Jacobi and "viscous"-Hamilton-Jacobi equations with convex nonlinearities—revisited. *Commun. Math. Sci.*, 8(2):627–637, 2010.

[25] S. Luo, Y. Yu, and H. Zhao. A new approximation for effective Hamiltonians for homogenization of a class of Hamilton-Jacobi equations. *Multiscale Model. Simul.*, 9(2):711–734, 2011.

[26] I. Matic and J. Nolen. A sublinear variance bound for solutions of a random Hamilton-Jacobi equation. *In preparation.*

[27] C. McDiarmid. On the method of bounded differences. In *Surveys in combinatorics, 1989 (Norwich, 1989)*, volume 141 of *London Math. Soc. Lecture Note Ser.*, pages 148–188. Cambridge Univ. Press, Cambridge, 1989.

[28] J. R. Munkres. *Topology: a first course.* Prentice-Hall Inc., Englewood Cliffs, N.J., 1975.

[29] A. M. Oberman, R. Takei, and A. Vladimirsky. Homogenization of metric Hamilton-Jacobi equations. *Multiscale Model. Simul.*, 8(1):269–295, 2009.

[30] F. Rezakhanlou. Central limit theorem for stochastic Hamilton-Jacobi equations. *Comm. Math. Phys.*, 211(2):413–438, 2000.

[31] F. Rezakhanlou and J. E. Tarver. Homogenization for stochastic Hamilton-Jacobi equations. *Arch. Ration. Mech. Anal.*, 151(4):277–309, 2000.

[32] P. E. Souganidis. Stochastic homogenization of Hamilton-Jacobi equations and some applications. *Asymptot. Anal.*, 20(1):1–11, 1999.

[33] A.-S. Sznitman. Distance fluctuations and Lyapounov exponents. *Ann. Probab.*, 24(3):1507–1530, 1996.

[34] A.-S. Sznitman. *Brownian motion, obstacles and random media.* Springer Monographs in Mathematics. Springer-Verlag, Berlin, 1998.

[35] M. Talagrand. Concentration of measure and isoperimetric inequalities in product spaces. *Inst. Hautes Études Sci. Publ. Math.*, (81):73–205, 1995.

[36] M. V. Wüthrich. Fluctuation results for Brownian motion in a Poissonian potential. *Ann. Inst. H. Poincaré Probab. Statist.*, 34(3):279–308, 1998.

[37] Y. Zhang. On the concentration and the convergence rate with a moment condition in first passage percolation. *Stochastic Process. Appl.*, 120(7):1317–1341, 2010.

Department of Mathematics, University of Wisconsin, Madison, 480 Lincoln Drive, Madison, Wisconsin 53706.

E-mail address: `armstron@math.wisc.edu`

Ceremade (UMR CNRS 7534), Université Paris-Dauphine, Place du Maréchal De Lattre De Tassigny, 75775 Paris CEDEX 16, France

E-mail address: `cardaliaguet@ceremade.dauphine.fr`

Department of Mathematics, The University of Chicago, 5734 S. University Avenue Chicago, Illinois 60637.

E-mail address: `souganidis@math.uchicago.edu`